HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Wednesday 9 October 1985

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

PETITION: ANTI DISCRIMINATION BILL

A petition signed by 20 residents of South Australia praying that the House delete the words 'sexuality, marital status and pregnancy' from the Anti Discrimination Bill 1984 and provide for the recognition of the primacy of marriage and parenthood was presented by the Hon. P.B. Arnold.

Petition received.

PETITION: FLINDERS RANGES NATIONAL PARK

A petition signed by 46 residents of South Australia praying that the House ensures that the Flinders Ranges National Park remains inviolate and is extended, where possible, was presented by the Hon. D.C. Brown.

Petition received.

PETITION: PORT AUGUSTA BOTANIC GARDEN

A petition signed by 107 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Government to establish an arid lands botanic garden at Port Augusta was presented by Mr M.J. Evans.

Petition received.

PETITION: CRIME

A petition signed by 500 residents of South Australia praying that the House legislate to increase the penalties for crime; provide greater resources to the police; and reject the automatic release of prisoners was presented by the Hon. Michael Wilson.

Petition received.

QUESTION TIME

OLYMPIC SPORTS FIELD

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: Has the Premier, as Treasurer, approved the use of State Government funds by the Burnside council to take legal action against the Athletics Association of South Australia over the lease of Olympic Sports Field?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: No. Such an application or request for authorisation has not come before me as Treasurer. Incidentally, the situation referred to by the Deputy Leader is at present of great concern to the Government. The Government has made an extremely generous offer to upgrade, in fact to replace, the current track at the Olympic Sports Field, especially to allow certain national athletics titles to take place next year. My colleague the Minister of Recreation and Sport has worked hard and long and has advocated strongly in order to get that Government support (about $800 000). In view of past support given to the Amateur Athletics Association, that represents a major contribution by Government which the association itself has not had to raise.

However, as one of the conditions attached to that taking place the Government has suggested that a committee structure should be set in place to resolve the conflicts between the various users of the Olympic Sports Field. Anyone who knows anything about the sports field will know that over the years (and the shadow Minister is obviously aware of this) there has been considerable conflict amongst the users. The Athletics Association has the head lease from the Burnside council. In turn the Adelaide City Soccer Club—part of the Philips League National Competition—also uses it as its home ground. Little Athletics, the Schools Athletics Association and other groups all use it.

There have been tensions and problems about lights, use of the track and availability. The Government saw this as a major opportunity to resolve those problems in working with the Burnside council to try to establish some format of management to allow these things to be resolved. Unfortunately, the Athletics Association has not seen fit to cooperate in that. I know that my colleague is meeting with them in an attempt to resolve the situation. I hope that in the interests of athletics, as well as of the other users of the Olympic Sports Field, the matter can be resolved. It seems to me extraordinary that any organisation that has seen such tangible Government support offered to it to upgrade its facilities is more intent on putting impediments in its way than accepting and working with the Government to ensure that we have a first-class facility on which to hold national championships.

THIRD ARTERIAL ROAD

Mrs APPLEBY: Will the Minister of Transport clearly define the process required to be followed for the construction of roadways such as the third arterial from Sturt Road south through Darlington? I seek an explanation on behalf of constituents in my area who believe that the Opposition have been attempting to manipulate them by feeding them misinformation based on a texta line on a photocopied page of a street directory. When specific information was sought at two meetings recently, the residents adjacent to the announced construction were ignored or treated with contempt—their words, not mine. They believe the Opposition spokesman on transport has made many false claims regarding cost, timing and further suggested alignments not based on any engineering knowledge. Further, he has never alluded to the public comment stage required in any such development.

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: I thank the honourable member for her question. I am very concerned about the two meetings to which she has referred and will comment on that issue briefly in my response. I know that the honourable member is aware—and I would have thought that every member in this House would be aware—of the basic procedures followed by the Highways Department in any major road construction project. These procedures can be placed into three distinct categories: first, the project planning stage; secondly, the public involvement stage; and thirdly, the adoption for detailed design and construction stage.

The Darlington by-pass—or third arterial, as it is sometimes known—has followed those procedures. In fact, the first stage—the project planning stage—has undergone general work for something like the past 18 months. A month ago a project team was established to evaluate, amongst other things, the appropriate road alignment, having regard to the critical factors of the social, environmental and economic needs that exist within that region. As a consequence of the study, a number of alignments are to be evaluated. When that work is completed (and I am advised that it will

not be completed before June 1986) the project will be put out for public comment. That will be the second stage. Each of the varied alignments within the corridor will be available for such comment.

The third stage will be the adoption of the preferred alignment and commencement of detail design work leading into the construction phase. The member for Davenport (the Opposition spokesman for transport matters), aided and abetted, I understand, by the member for Glenelg, knowing full well the procedures followed in any major road construction, I guess was having a little sport at the expense of citizens at Seacombe Heights. However, I think it is quite clear that the target was the Government. Of course, as is usual with these two gentlemen, they missed.

On Sunday, the member for Davenport and the member for Glenelg were at Seacombe Heights doing what they do best—beavering away, purveying untruths, and causing fear and confusion within that community. I thought this was a pretty shoddy performance, even for the member for Davenport, but I was surprised that the member for Glenelg would lend himself to such activity. For honourable members opposite to go into the southern region and tell the citizens that the Government had a plan to take a major arterial road right through their houses, I think is behaviour of the most despicable kind, and I condemn them. They know, as we know, and as the citizens in the south know, that the Government has no such plan.

The Hon. Ted Chapman: They told me when I was down there doorknocking a fortnight ago.

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: That just goes to show the effect of the spreading of misinformation by members opposite. Frankly, I think members opposite should be condemned for that. My advice to the citizens of the south is to treat with a great deal of suspicion any comments made by the shadow Minister when he purports to speak of the Government's transport policies. I also advise them to check very closely with the member for Davenport about his Party's policies. I assure the people of the south that, when the Government has presented to it the various alignments that are being considered and evaluated, those alignments will be put on public display, and comments from the local community will be called for. As has been done on previous occasions, those comments will be treated very seriously and will have some influence on the Government's final decision. I finish as I began: to play politics with the fears and concerns of local communities, to spread fear about a project when those who are spreading that fear know full well the facts of the case, is an action that should be condemned by every fair-minded member of Parliament.

OLYMPIC SPORTS FIELD

Mr OLSEN: In view of his response to the Deputy Leader, will the Premier immediately investigate a commitment that the Minister of Recreation and Sport gave to the Burnside council in relation to the lease of the Olympic Sports Field to determine whether the Minister has broken the law or exposed the Government to liability for civil damages? I have a copy of a letter dated 27 September, signed by the Minister of Recreation and Sport and addressed to the Mayor of Burnside. In that letter the Minister gives a commitment that the State Government will meet half of any legal costs incurred by the council if the Athletics Association challenges the new management and leasing agreement proposed for the Olympic Sports Field.

I have been informed that the Minister's action exposes him and the Government to a legal challenge on two grounds: the first involves a common law crime dealing with an agreement to pay the legal costs of another person in a civil action; and the second arises as a civil liability where it is a tort if a person induces a party to a contract to break that contract.

In this case the Minister of Recreation and Sport has encouraged the Burnside council to break a 10-year lease that it has with the Athletic Association on the use of the Olympic Sports Field. Legal advice that we have obtained is that, by writing this letter, there is the strong possibility that the Minister has committed a common law misdemeanour and that, because the Burnside council has agreed to break the lease on Olympic Sports Field, the Government is also exposed to a liability for civil damages. In view of the unprecedented commitment by the Minister of taxpayers funds to another level of government to fight an amateur sports body, will the Premier immediately investigate the Minister's actions?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I do not know the basis or strength of the legal advice given to members opposite. They are certainly conspicuously lacking a lawyer in their ranks and have been for some time. It shows in their contributions to debate, their analysis of legislation, and in many other things. As I explained in answer to the Deputy Leader of the Opposition a moment ago, the Minister of Recreation and Sport has been involved in protracted and very difficult negotiations over this issue. Those negotiations have involved a number of parties with direct interest in the matter, including the Government. We have a very direct interest in that we are offering $800 000 to take particular action. The matter involves the Burnside council, the Athletics Association, the Adelaide City Soccer Club, and a number of other organisations. I think I have adequately illustrated to this House in the previous answer the problems with which the Minister is grappling.

As to the specific matters raised, naturally I will get a report from my Minister, who is continuing negotiations and who has advised me that he is having meetings. I would suggest that it is in the interests of those members opposite who represent contituents in that area, and those few members opposite who have any kind of interest or understanding of sport and the promotion of sport in this State, to get their facts straight before they jump in on this issue. It is an extraordinary thing that, apart from not having a lawyer in their ranks, members opposite have not had an official spokesman, a shadow Minister of Recreation and Sport, for about two years—nobody. We see the member for Bragg trotting around to various organisations, with no status whatsoever, stirring when he can and helping when he cannot, and that is fine. I welcome the interest that the honourable member shows, because it is a lot more than all his other colleagues show in sport and recreation. It is a scandal that the Opposition of this State, that poses as an alternative government, cannot find one person in its ranks to speak for recreation and sport. I suspect that the way they are gabbling—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: They do not like this.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I call the Leader of the Opposition to order.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: It really exposes a major deficiency in probably one of the most important areas of State, Government and community activity that they do not have anyone who is on top of it. I suggest that jumping in as they have can be seen only as their typical knocking, stirring, negative approach. We are trying to do something for the sport of athletics. We are prepared to put the money up to do it, but what do we get from the other side? Cavilling, complaining, and hints of great scandals and problems. Now, Mr Speaker, we will see.

NEIGHBOURHOOD WATCH

Mr GREGORY: Can the Minister of Emergency Services advise me whether the Modbury Heights and Modbury North areas will be considered for a Neighbourhood Watch program in the immediate future? I have been advised of the successful introduction of the Neighbourhood Watch program in Flinders Park, in that it has brought about a reduction in house breakings, a community awareness and a major improvement in neighbourhood relations.

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: Yes, I can certainly give the honourable member an assurance that the area that he identifies will be very seriously considered for such a program. The Neighbourhood Watch program is proceeding very successfully on a trial basis. Not the least of its advantages is the sort of profiles that are coming forward as to the people who are involved in misdemeanours. Honourable members may have seen a very interesting article in this morning's *Advertiser* in relation to this matter, in which it was revealed that overseas studies had indicated that the sort of caricature of the break and enter criminal that perhaps people have in their mind is indeed somewhat misleading, and that for the most part breaking and entering occurs as a result of a relatively young person from the immediate surrounding area taking it in to their minds to proceed in this criminal way.

These misdemeanours are not generally associated with drug abuse, although they often arise from problems related to prolonged bouts of unemployment. The aspect of people assisting the police in a total control of, particularly, breaking and entering and that sort of crime in their area has the wholehearted support of the Government. Obviously, as we move through the trial period and consider other areas that would be suitable for such treatment, we would keep in mind the sort of representations that the honourable member has made.

OLYMPIC SPORTS FIELD

Mr INGERSON: My question is to the Minister of Recreation and Sport.

Members interjecting:

Mr INGERSON: Surprise, surprise! Will the Minister of Recreation and Sport withdraw and correct the statement that he made in the *Advertiser* this morning that the Athletic Association of South Australia does not hold the lease of the Olympic Sports Field? The Minister's statement is completely wrong, and it shows that he does not even read the letters that he signs. The Opposition has in its possession a series of letters which records the fact that the Athletic Association has a new 10-year lease on Olympic Sports Field. The Athletic Association has paid $8 000 for the first year of that lease. What is more, in a letter to the Athletic Association dated 28 August this year the Minister said:

> It is unfortunate that the association is not prepared to relinquish the control of the Olympic Sports Field.

Yet, in the *Advertiser* this morning, in relation to the Athletic Association, the Minister said:

> There is a mistaken view that they control the ground.

The Hon. J.W. SLATER: I do not intend to withdraw what I said this morning. The advice I have is that, even though the Athletic Association has paid its fee to the Burnside council this year, the actual lease has not been signed and, as a consequence, technically the association does not at present have a lease over the facility.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.W. SLATER: I know that the member for Glenelg had an unhappy childhood—he even has the unfortunate circumstance to barrack for Glenelg—and he is demonstrating that today. He did not have many friends when he was young, and I understand that his mother used to tie a pork chop around his neck so that the dog would play with him!

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. SLATER: Getting back to the question, I have an answer, and I will provide it in my own way when I have the opportunity, rather than when the Opposition is behaving like a pack of hyenas, and trying to grandstand and make political capital out of a certain situation. We should note correctly exactly what is the situation. In October 1985—

An honourable member: 1984.

The Hon. J.W. SLATER: I mean 1984.

The Hon. Ted Chapman: You got the year wrong.

The Hon. J.W. SLATER: All right. If members opposite all want to interject at the one time, it is all right with me, but, if they want to hear the story with regard to the Olympic Sports Field and learn something, they should provide me with an opportunity to tell them. Last year we had evidence and letters from the Athletic Association asking the Government to take over those facilities. In March this year the Association made personal representations to the Premier and me and a submission stating that it was important and imperative that the track be upgraded, because it had deteriorated over a number of years. Also, a number of championships are to be held—particularly the national athletics championships in March next year. That meeting is a lead-up to selections for the Commonwealth Games in Edinburgh. After that submission, the Government decided to renew the track, not just upgrade it, at a cost of $800 000. We called for tenders and received six, from which Superturf Holdings was accepted. To my amazement, suddenly the Athletic Association did a complete somersault.

Mr Ingerson: You really can't tell the truth. You have terrible trouble.

The Hon. J.W. SLATER: Some of the things mentioned by the honourable member in his question are incorrect. Also, a lot of the information that the honourable member has obtained from the Athletic Association is also wrong. We determined that Superturf Holdings was the successful tenderer. Now we find that the association is complaining about lack of consultation.

Mr Ingerson: They wrote to you on the day of your press release.

The Hon. J.W. SLATER: That was one of about 12 letters over a period. The association was consulted, because Ian Boswell (a member of the association) was well aware of what was happening in relation to the track. In addition, the association raised the question of the management committee. The Athletic Association is not contributing to the track in this case. Other user groups have been most discontented about the situation for some years. I refer to the Adelaide City Soccer Club, the Schools Association and, in particular, Little Athletics. The Opposition is saying that these people have no responsibility in the matter at all; they are not entitled to be there. What it is saying is incorrect.

As Minister, I and my department have had continual consultation with the athletics people on this matter for the past 18 months. Unfortunately, I have found them most unpredictable and unreliable. They do no credit to the sport that they represent. I do not think that the member for Bragg or his colleagues should politically grandstand over this issue. It does no credit to them. It is an important facility for other user groups; it is a State facility, even though it is owned by Burnside council and although the lease has been given to two groups of people over some years. What is happening—

Mr Ingerson: You are interfering.

The Hon. J.W. SLATER: I am not interfering with anything at all. We are trying to provide a facility which will be used by people involved in athletics and by all other user groups. There is nothing wrong with that. As far as I am concerned, all the other furphies that have been raised this afternoon are worth very little. For the information of the Leader of the Opposition, my department and I sought Crown Law advice on the letter to which he has referred today.

LONG SERVICE LEAVE

Ms LENEHAN: Will the Minister of Education tell the House what situation currently exists with respect to the granting of long service leave for teachers employed by both the Education Department and the Department of Technical and Further Education? Further, what funding has been allocated for the 1985-86 financial year for long service leave for teachers and lecturers?

I was recently approached by one of my constituents who expressed concern that 12 teachers at a secondary school in my electorate have recently had their applications for long service leave refused. As I know that there is some concern in the teaching community and within both the education sector and TAFE about this issue, I ask the Minister to clarify the current situation.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: I am quite happy to clarify the situation for the benefit of the honourable member. With respect to the first part of the honourable member's question, it is an improved situation, because extra funds have been made available for long service leave provisions in both the Education Department and TAFE in the 1985-86 financial year. In relation to the Education Department the improvement is of the order of some 15 000 days extra for long service leave provisions, amounting to something over $1 million on top of the base figure. In addition, the increase in the Department of Technical and Further Education is approximately $300 000 over and above last year's base figure, which of course has been increased with the CPI.

That situation means that more days involving long service leave pay are available for both departments. That should provide increased opportunities for teachers who have been accumulating long service leave to take it. However, I suppose it will not automatically resolve a problem that has been occurring over recent years because of the changing age profile of people employed within both those departments. As the average age of people within TAFE, for example, increases year by year, naturally the number of teachers or lecturers who are eligible for long service leave will likewise increase, and it is a matter that is subject to ongoing examination by the respective departments; indeed, it is a matter on which I have had ongoing discussions with Cabinet and with Treasury.

In relation to the specific complaint received by the honourable member concerning the teachers at the high school within her electorate, there is a very important point involved that I am not certain will be addressed by any extra funds, and that is the matter of 12 people who have applied for long service of durations shorter than a term-long break and who have had those applications refused. I may say that it is still my intention, and the intention of the Education Department, not to support applications for long service leave breaks that are less than a term long, except in the most exceptional circumstances.

Clearly, we would provide for cases where people, for strong personal or emotional reasons, want to apply to take long service leave shorter than the term. Those exemptions that have applied in the past will continue to apply, but, in relation to applications from people who want to take such leave as recreation leave simply for a two, three, four or five week period during term time, as a standard rule they will not be approved. The reason for that is that we, on the other hand, receive a lot of complaints from parents who are concerned about the turnover of teachers that their children have to sometimes face and that there may be a number of breaks in the continuity of the teachers with whom their children come into contact. That is a legitimate concern of those parents, because they want some continuity in their children's education.

I support that and believe that, if people are taking long service leave, they should endeavour, as far as possible, to take it in term-long breaks so that we may minimise the discontinuity of teachers with respect to individual students. I know that the matter of discontinuity has been raised by other concerned members of this House, parents having raised this issue with them, so I intend to maintain that policy which generally discourages the taking of long service leave breaks in shorter than term lengths. For that reason, the 12 people who approached the honourable member would not be likely to have that matter reconsidered favourably.

If they were to apply for a term-long break, I could guarantee that we would try to meet their needs as early as possible. Indeed, the department is keen to try to meet the needs of teachers as early as possible and, if we cannot meet them this term, we try to meet them within a term or two thereafter. As to the financial situation, we have increased in significant real terms the allocation of long service leave in both the Education Department and the Department of Technical and Further Education.

OLYMPIC SPORTS FIELD

The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON: Why did the Minister of Recreation and Sport ignore the advice of the Athletics Association of South Australia and other experts regarding the most appropriate surface to be laid at the Olympic Sports Field? After the close of tenders for this project, there were six proposals, and the Athletics Association expressed reservations about all but one of those proposals. The only proposal it supported was the Recortan surface, which has been used on the magnificent tracks in Canberra and Melbourne. Before the Canberra track was laid, a party of technical experts travelled overseas to obtain information for a track suitable for Australian conditions. Despite this, the Minister overlooked the Recortan surface in favour of the West German manufactured Regupol.

I have been informed by Mr John Daly, the highly respected national coach of the Australian athletics team, that he has not seen a similar track used outdoors anywhere in the world. He believes instead that the ballistic rubber type track is the best. Further, it appears that the Minister and his officers did not consult with experts in this matter after the close of tenders. On 1 October, the Athletics Association wrote to the Minister expressing its concerns about the type of track selected, but all the Minister has done in response is to criticise the association.

The Hon. J.W. SLATER: We did not ignore the advice of the people concerned, including the association. We accepted advice from other people who gave us the unqualified opinion that there were 107 tracks, both indoor and outdoor, throughout the world, with a Regupol surface, which is a West German product as is Recortan. The information which was given me and which my officers obtained from all concerned proved that the Regupol track complied with the tender requirements, and we accepted that tender. There is always argument about what is the best synthetic

surface. We had six tenders and, as we believed that this track complied with the tender requirements, we accepted it accordingly.

I understand that in Los Angeles two outdoor tracks of this surface were used for warm-up proceedings during the Olympic Games, although the main track is of another surface. However, I am informed that those two tracks, which were used for that purpose, have withstood weather conditions much more satisfactorily than has the main track, which is of another surface. Certainly, those persons involved in the industry (and, indeed, perhaps in athletics) all had varying views about what was the best surface.

Mr Becker: So we got a warm-up track?

The Hon. J.W. SLATER: No, we got a first-class track at the right price. Members opposite can put whatever interpretation they like on it, but this is yet another example of the knocking, whingeing and carping that we have heard about every sporting facility. All sorts of statements have been made, and the whole purpose of the exercise has been to knock the Government. The Opposition does not have much of a record in that regard. It is the first time that any Government has provided first-class facilities for sport, yet the hyenas opposite simply carp, cringe and criticise every time we do something. The member for Torrens, who asked the question, has a nil record. In his three years as Minister of Recreation and Sport he did not provide one first-class facility for sport. Our scores are on the board.

The Hon. Michael Wilson interjecting.

The Hon. J.W. SLATER: I put the Aquatic Centre right at the top and, if the honourable member is there on Sunday, he will see it. I do not know whether he has an invitation but, if so, he will probably send his message boy along, as he does everywhere else. The honourable member should come along to the opening and assess it for himself. Roller skating—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.W. SLATER: I raise the issue of the hockey stadium, which is of potential advantage to three sports. The first day after the announcement, a member opposite got up and criticised every aspect of it.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. SLATER: Members opposite criticised everything about it, and the same applies to other sporting facilities that this Government has provided. Members cringe and carp about everything we do. Here is another example of the Opposition trying to find loopholes as far as the synthetic surface is concerned. The Government has acted correctly in the whole matter. It has acceded to the requests of the association and now, for some reason or another, the Opposition does not want it.

Mr Ashenden: I wonder why!

The Hon. J.W. SLATER: I will tell the honourable member why.

Mr Ingerson: Because you want to take over.

The Hon. J.W. SLATER: I do not want to take over, and neither does my department. The real reason is that, over a period of 10 years or so, the association has been paying $2 000 to the Burnside council for a six-month lease. It has been subletting the field to other user groups and charging them full tote odds, thus making a substantial profit in the process. The balance sheet shows that it received something like $13 000 in hire fees. All other user groups, including the children in Little Athletics, have been not ripped off but overcharged for that surface. Not only have they been overcharged, but there have been arguments about usage of the facility. I do not believe that that should be the case. A management committee is the only way to go, and that is what the Government is going to do.

THIRD ARTERIAL ROAD

Mr TRAINER: Will the Minister of Transport give an assurance that the Government will display a more compassionate and sensitive response to any residents likely to be affected by proposals for roadworks than has been displayed to date by the Liberal spokesman on transport? Along the fading shadow of the obsolete MATS route from Darlington to Thebarton, over 800 householders have been caused renewed concern by an election gimmick put forward by the Liberal transport spokesman, who is proposing to slash a six-lane swathe through this heavily populated area. Contrary to the impression given by the member for Davenport, the majority of properties along that obsolete route are privately owned, with only 23 per cent of the section between Sturt Road and Anzac Highway being owned by the Highways Department.

Furthermore, even on the program put forward by the member for Davenport, a motorway using the obsolete MATS line would be an item for the year 2000 or thereabouts, although the member for Davenport gave many local residents the impression that it would spring up overnight, like mushrooms, almost simultaneously with a freeway south of Darlington that apparently he has copied from the third arterial road planned by the Government.

A great deal of concern in the electorates of Hayward, Mitchell, Walsh and Peake has been caused by the member for Davenport, and many constituents have approached me expressing their concern. One constituent, who expressed the view that local residents were being treated as freeway fodder for the sake of an election stunt, told me that when she telephoned the Liberal spokesman on transport matters he had responded by suggesting that she should sell out of the area as fast as she could. When she stressed that she liked the family character of the neighbourhood he said that it was a lower class area and that she should move to a higher class suburb.

Members interjecting:

Mr TRAINER: Can the Minister of Transport assure us that the current Government would have a more sensitive approach than that shown by the member opposite who has shown some sensitivity only about the fact that he is insensitive?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: I can assure the honourable member, all members of the House, and all citizens of South Australia that in any acquisition program involving this Government in terms of a new highway, arterial construction or for any other reason a considerable degree of sensitivity will be shown. I think it should be pointed out that the acquisition of any property as a result of arterial construction is really in two parts. The first part, as the member for Torrens would know, is very easy. Many people are quite happy to move out and to sell their home. However, there is another group who want to stay, fight very hard to stay, and are very difficult to persuade that they should have their house acquired. In fact, I think it took the member for Torrens and my colleague the previous Minister of Transport some four years to acquire some 34 houses along the north-east corridor. People do fight very hard—

The Hon. Michael Wilson interjecting:

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: I am absolutely certain. There is no doubt that the member for Torrens did and would show a great deal of compassion; it is his colleague that we wish he would talk to. The member for Davenport would seek to acquire 500 properties along the old north-south corridor. That corridor is no longer an option. I am interested that the member for Davenport has totally repudiated his colleague the member for Torrens when, as Min-

ister of Transport in South Australia, the member for Torrens made a ministerial statement in this House on Wednesday 24 February 1982. The member for Torrens was talking about the difficulty in being able to determine a static or consistent policy for a corridor, and he was complaining that he inherited a difficult situation from the previous Government (about which I will not argue). The member for Torrens said:

> This has led to quite serious planning blight in the areas affected, since both residents and business people have been left uncertain about the future of their areas, and have not known whether to develop their properties or not.

The member for Torrens then went on to make a number of what I regard as very compassionate and sensible statements and, in conclusion, he referred to a four-lane highway as a concept, not a plan, and said:

> The final decision on whether a modified freeway should be constructed is something that the State Government will have to make well into the future, taking into account the planning work that is now to be done, and in particular taking into account whether it is able to fund the project, which has an estimated cost of over $200 000 000 (in 1982 prices).
>
> To the residents in the corridor, and particularly to the many people who live in the section between Darlington and Anzac Highway, I want to say that they should realise that, if a freeway was to be constructed eventually, that section would be the last to be built, and that would be many years from now.

This Government decided last year not to proceed with the corridor concept.

The member for Davenport complained, as he usually does. As I pointed out last Friday, and as I will point out again, I could not put the response in clearer terms than the *News* did in its editorial of 27 February 1984, as follows:

> Politicians traffic in one commodity, words, frequently to the exclusion of realities and the evidence of their eyes.
>
> State Opposition transport spokesman, Mr Brown, is waxing indignant over scrapping of the north-south freeway plan, citing a leaked report.
>
> Even with projected population growth around Morphett Vale, the notion of such colossal expense—$240 million—cannot be justified.
>
> Mr Brown may be looking to future problems, but he is proposing yesterday's solutions.

One of the problems that the north-south corridor is causing to development in that area is the concept that, while you have the corridor, you do not need to look at other available planning options, such as traffic management, etc., because you can always cite the corridor as being the panacea of all the traffic needs, even though you might not do anything about it.

This Government has decided that it will look at the traffic needs of all metropolitan Adelaide within the social, economic, traffic and technological needs that exist at the time. It is no good hanging on to a 1968 concept for a twenty-first century problem. If we followed the MATS plan that the honourable member for Davenport is following, we would see that it said that in 1986, unless we had a system of freeways or the clover leaf system throughout Adelaide, the traffic flow would have clogged up. We have no massive freeway or clover leaf system, and I defy any citizen here to say that the traffic flow in Adelaide has clogged up. The same sort of planning decisions that were wrong in 1968 for 1986 could be wrong in 1985 for the year 2000 and beyond.

This Government has taken a very sensitive position concerning the properties of people who may well be affected by the policies that the Opposition pick up in Opposition but reject in government. It was interesting that, when all the information was available to a Liberal member in government, he performs very sensitively and very sensibly. However, when that technical advice is not available to that member in Opposition, he can be quite outrageous, particularly when he never expects to be a Minister of Transport, anyway.

In answer to the honourable member, yes, we will be much more sensitive in any acquisition program in which we may have to be involved anywhere in the metropolitan area of Adelaide. Quite frankly, I cannot understand how any member of Parliament could have reacted to a constituent or an individual as the honourable member is reputed to have done. However, I have heard reports of the two meetings that he has attended recently, so it does not surprise me at all.

THIRD ARTERIAL ROAD

Mr MATHWIN: Will the member for Brighton acknowledge that last Saturday morning she met several residents from the Seacombe Heights area and showed them a detailed map of the Labor Government's proposed third arterial road through Seacombe Heights? At a residents meeting at Seacombe Heights last Sunday morning, which I might say was well attended—it was a very good meeting with two very good members of Parliament present—several residents talked of the meeting that they had with the member for Brighton. These residents claimed that the member had shown them a detailed map of the proposed third arterial road which would run adjacent to Camelot Crescent and Alpine Road. The residents at the Sunday meeting voiced their strong opposition to the Labor Party's proposal and, indeed, supported the planned route of the Liberal Party's north-south transport corridor. They formed an action committee to fight any proposal to put the road through Seacombe Heights.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member can elect to answer the question or not, as she pleases, and should not be under any obligation to do so.

Mrs APPLEBY: I am very happy to have this opportunity to respond to the question put to me by the member for Glenelg. The members for Glenelg and Davenport seem to be under some misapprehension about the map that I have in my office. That map has been in operation for some 15 years and relates to the north-south corridor, as set out at the time of the announcement of that corridor. The map has been used to explain to residents of the area the actual location of the north-south corridor in order to give them some idea of what was being said in relation to the proposal.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mrs APPLEBY: Secondly, that map has marked on it several areas of green, which from time to time are shaded in to indicate the property which the Government owns, and which comprises some houses and some reserved land. This gives the residents who come to speak to me as the local member the opportunity to understand fully what the situation is and to discuss with me the potential proposal, the method by which that proposal will be carried out, and at what stage they will have the opportunity for public comment—not based on dotted lines but on the facts that will be prepared in the detailed design and construction plan stage. So, I am very happy to answer the question from the member for Glenelg.

SALES TAX

Mr HAMILTON: Will the Minister of Education consult, if necessary, with his federal colleague, Senator Susan Ryan, in relation to carrying out an investigation into the present system of sales tax on school books and stationery? Recently, I wrote to the Minister of Education about this matter after

it had been brought to my attention by the principal of a school in my electorate. In my letter to the Minister, I said:

I am writing to you with regard to the sales tax which presently applies to schools when goods obtained from State Supply are resold to students.

I understand there are currently two schemes operating in primary schools whereby under the 'old' scheme the school issues to students a booklist of their stationery requirements for that year, and those purchases become the students' property. However, the school must pay sales tax on the sale of those items.

Under the 'new' scheme, an account is sent to the parents for a set fee, which incorporates the students' stationery requirements for the year, whether they are fully used or not. If the school opts for this scheme, sales tax does not have to be paid as the books remain the property of the school.

It seems incongruous that in both cases the stationery and book requirements of the student are to be used for school purposes, yet one scheme requires sales tax, and the other does not.

In view of the obvious drawbacks of operating under two schemes, where in one the school is disadvantaged, and the other where the student is disadvantaged, I would ask that consideration be given to a uniform scheme whereby sales tax is exempt on stationery requirements where they are to be used for school purposes.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: I guess that the difficult assessment to be made by the federal tax department is to what extent materials sold are in fact being used for education purposes. I know that with respect to equipment and materials bought by teachers or lecturers in tertiary education they must provide some evidence that it is to be used for educational purposes. Indeed, I believe that a ruling has been given to some people that in order to purchase microcomputers tax free they must prove that the equipment is to be located for the majority of the time at an educational institution.

So, that tends to be the main problem area, and I guess it is proof of what the purchase is for. I think that the anomaly raised by the honourable member, is well worth pursuing further, and I will take it up with my federal colleague the Minister for Education. However, I believe it would more appropriately have to result in an approach either by myself or by her, depending on the discussions we have on the matter, to the federal Treasurer, because this clearly comes within the purview of the Australian Taxation Office. I am happy to undertake to make those further inquiries.

THIRD ARTERIAL ROAD

The Hon. D.C. BROWN: Why did the Minister of Transport claim last Monday that the Labor Party had no proposed route for the third arterial road, when the member for Brighton and the Highways Department have been discussing specific proposals with local residents showing a specific map of the proposed route through Seacombe Heights? Yesterday in both the *Advertiser*—

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. D.C. BROWN: I will come to that matter in a moment, former Minister, because your Party has the facts completely wrong as far as the map is concerned. Yesterday, in both the *Advertiser* and the *News*, the Minister of Transport is reported as having said that he was not even close to proposing a route to ease southern traffic congestion from the third arterial road.

In the *News* he accused me of circulating a map of the preferred Labor Party route. I think that the Minister would agree that that is what he claimed. I circulated a letter—a copy of which I will make available to you, Mr Speaker, to the Minister, and the member for Brighton—and an attached map of the Liberal Party's proposed north-south transport corridor; not the Labor Party's proposal. Furthermore, I have not circulated any Labor Party proposal whatsoever. This morning, I received the following statement, signed by residents of three different addresses in Seacombe Heights:

We, the undersigned, hereby declare that we have sighted plans for a third arterial road running from Sturt Road to Majors Road and prepared by the Highways Department—

not my map: 'by the Highways Department'—

The said plans follow a path adjacent to the boundaries of homes in Camelot Crescent and Alpine Road, Seacombe Heights.

That letter was signed by three residents whose names I am happy to make available to the member for Brighton, the Minister of Transport and to the press.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D.C. BROWN: Many other residents have made similar claims to me about the map they have seen in the member for Brighton's electorate office. Yesterday afternoon, the member for Brighton's electorate secretary, when telephoned about the proposed third arterial road route, was still offering to make appointments for residents to speak to the member for Brighton and to see the detailed map of the proposed route.

This morning, between 7 and 8 o'clock, a letter bearing the name of the member for Brighton—and I have a copy of it in my possession—was circulated to Seacombe Heights houses. I ask the member for Brighton to listen to this, because in that letter she acknowledged that the third arterial road, the Labor Party proposal, followed the same corridor set aside some 19 years ago—the very map about which they are talking!

Members interjecting:

The Hon. D.C. BROWN: It is in a letter: it follows the same route as the route set down 19 years ago.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member will resume his seat. I ask the House to come to order. First, I have been extremely tolerant, because a great deal of the comments made by the member for Davenport have no apparent bearing on the question and hence are irrelevant.

The Hon. D.C. Brown interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I ask the honourable member for Davenport to listen to the ruling I am giving so that he will, I hope, follow it. So far I have been very tolerant in the sense that a number of the observations made by the honourable gentleman do not seem to relate back to his original question. Nevertheless, in the tolerant style normally allowed in Question Time, I have allowed him to proceed.

Secondly (and this is becoming much more difficult), there is the straying, in terms of relevance, into the debating area as to what the honourable member for Brighton may or may not have said and then, further removed again, as to what the electorate assistant may or may not have said. I ask the honourable member to come back to the question and I ask other honourable members to cease barracking while the member for Davenport is putting his question.

The Hon. D.C. BROWN: I was pointing out to the House a factual statement and saying that in fact the member for Brighton had distributed a letter dated 7 October which indicates that the third arterial road is following the same corridor set aside (and she used the phrase) 'some 19 years ago'. I point out that that corridor, from her own maps, runs right through Seacombe Heights, and that is the exact fear of the residents at Seacombe Heights, the reason they held the meeting on Sunday morning and the reason that they have formed an action committee to get the Labor Party members to change their proposals and their minds as to the route of that proposed road. The Liberal Party has been full and frank as to where its road goes, and it is about time the Labor Party was.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: First, I should point out that noise is no substitute for logic or accuracy, and there

never has been any clearer indication of that than what we have just seen in the last minute or two. I should start by thanking the member for Davenport in relation to a matter that has been causing concern to the member for Brighton and me. There was a report that said that the member for Davenport received from the member for Brighton a copy of the map. That certainly upset the member for Brighton, because she did not want to be known around South Australia as in any way having provided any information to somebody who misuses information in the way that the member for Davenport has, and it was certainly nothing that I said. I cannot account for it being reported as such in the *News*.

The Hon. D.C. Brown interjecting:

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: No, I did not. The honourable member did not say that the member for Davenport had obtained information from the honourable member for Brighton. So I certainly refute that statement. Secondly, the member for Davenport—

The Hon. D.C. Brown: It's in yesterday's paper and you haven't denied it.

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: What is the good!

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: The member for Davenport—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! First, we need only one incumbent in the Chair.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Those persons who are purporting to take over the duties of the Chair will please refrain from doing so for the rest of Question Time. Secondly, I would ask the House to show some respect for Standing Orders. The honourable Minister.

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: The member for Davenport has been saying for many months (certainly before I was Minister, and then since I was given this portfolio) that the Labor Party had no plans at all for the third arterial road, and he knows the procedures that apply within the Highways Department. He is now saying today that we have plans and that we have had them for 18 months. Where is the consistency there? Two months ago he was saying that we did not have any plans at all—he has been saying that consistently and loudly for weeks—but he is now saying that we do have plans, so the member for Davenport needs to get his act together.

Let me tell the House about this dotted line on the corridor upon which the member for Davenport places so much reliance. It is a dotted line on a map similar to the Liberal Party's dotted line on a map. That corridor that feeds the southern areas in which a third arterial or by-pass road can be constructed is large enough to take a number of alignments.

So, there is the opportunity for the Highways Department to recommend to the Government any of a number of options within that alignment. The honourable member has issued one of those alignments. He was going to tell my colleague about that, but he forgot. The Highways Department has spoken to people within the region, as it should, because the department has been doing the work for 18 months, on another alignment. The decision about the alignments will be made by the Government when it receives the Highways Department's recommendations. Such recommendations are not expected to reach my desk, as Minister of Transport, until June next year, and I will look at them then.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: The project team that is responsible for evaluating the various alignments was put in place only a month ago, when we established it. That team will evaluate various alignments, including the one which the member for Davenport is criticising loudly and vociferously. I expect that it will be similar to the one that the honourable member, with his technical wisdom and great experience in building roads, believes he can recommend to the South Australian community. However, I do not know whence he gets his technical expertise to do so.

The line to which honourable members opposite have drawn attention, and which exists on the map, was conceptual only and in a sense was the best technical guess at the time because the work had to be done for the department to be able to delineate a specific alignment. That line was needed at the time to indicate to people who might seek that information where the corridor is and where an arterial road might proceed. It is upon that conceptual drawing on the map that members opposite are trying to build their scare campaign.

The facts are clear: every member opposite understands the system, which is that technical design is done first and then put up for public comment. That public comment stage will not be reached until June next year. I believe that a number of alternative alignments will be put to the public for comment. In the meantime, it is all speculation. I ask everyone to stand back and give the people in the southern region the opportunity to make their comment at the appropriate time when recommendations have been made to me as Minister and when I release the discussion paper, as I have done in respect of Coromandel Valley and as I will do for many other arterials between now and 1990.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION: THIRD ARTERIAL ROAD

The Hon. D.C. BROWN (Davenport): I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

The Hon. D.C. BROWN: I wish to make a personal explanation of a couple of matters. First, in yesterday's *News* there is a statement on page 14, which states in part:

> He [Mr Keneally] was 'outraged' by Mr Brown's 'irresponsible' circulation of a map indicating 'the preferred Labor Party route'.

I point out that at no stage have I circulated to anyone a preferred Labor Party route for the third arterial road. I have circulated instead (and I have been frank with all the residents of Seacombe Heights, as elsewhere) the preferred route of the Liberal Party's proposed north-south transport corridor.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D.C. BROWN: The second matter that I wish to raise concerns the suggestion in that press report that in fact I have put forward the plans for this Labor Party proposal. This morning, I received a further letter from a resident in the Seacombe Heights area. That letter states:

> Following visits to June Appleby's office—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr Olsen: The front bench—

The SPEAKER: Order! I warn the Leader of the Opposition for reflecting on the Chair. He may consider himself to be treated very lightly. The member for Davenport has been in this place long enough to know that he is fully entitled to speak by way of personal explanation, but he must not debate the subject matter. I ask him to observe Standing Orders.

The Hon. D.C. BROWN: Thank you, Mr Speaker. I referred to the article in the *News* which makes certain accusations and clearly misrepresents the case that I have

put forward. As evidence to clear myself of the accusations that have been made, I shall read the further letter that I received this morning. It states:

Following visits to June Appleby's office, the previous owners of my house decided to sell. Also following my visit to Appleby, a neighbour [whose name is given but I will not disclose it here] put his property on the market in December 1984 and it remained unsold until February 1985, when it was finally withdrawn. These are current examples of the concerns of residents following the sighting of the [after yesterday's claim by the Minister] non-existent plans.

That letter is signed by the person who wrote it. That is clear evidence that it was the residents who were concerned and who came to me, and it is also evidence that I have not prefabricated these plans that I have brought before the public.

Further, the member for Ascot Park quoted what he claimed someone had said to him following an apparent telephone conversation that that woman had with me. During the Estimates Committee, the honourable member voiced the same claim last Friday, and he knows full well that, during that Estimates Committee, I flatly denied having made that statement. I accused the person (if, in fact, that person made the statement to the honourable member because I have serious doubts that it was made) of being a liar in making those statements, if they were made to the honourable member, because at no stage did I make that statement or any similar statement.

Because of the false and rather damaging claims made publicly by the Minister of Transport, both in yesterday's *Advertiser* and yesterday's *News*, in which he has accused me of the worst form of behaviour, including terrorist campaigns, and because he is so wrong on the facts, especially in the light of the admission now made by the member for Brighton in her letter, in which she acknowledged this morning to the local residents that the proposed corridor is the same route as the third arterial road, I ask the Minister of Transport to withdraw fully and apologise for the outrageous untruths that he has told publicly.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I ask the House to come to order. There is no need for animal and bird calls in the process. The honourable Minister of Transport.

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

Leave granted.

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: In view of the article in yesterday's *News* and the use made of it by the member for Davenport, it would be wise for me to read to the House my press statement, so that members may then draw their own conclusions as to the accuracy of the press article as opposed to the contents of my press statement. The press statement is as follows:

Transport Minister Gavin Keneally today accused Liberal transport spokesman Dean Brown of playing 'terrorist politics'. He was referring to the calling of a public meeting and the circularising of a letter on the subject of the route of the Labor Government's third arterial from Sturt Road to Reynella. Mr Keneally said that the circular and statements at the protest meeting amounted to a campaign of fear. The people of Seacombe Heights were being stampeded into believing that the planned third arterial would run 'through the middle of Seacombe Heights'—

there it is in the letter—

The State Government had not yet decided where the road would run. A Highways Department team has begun work on the best alignment, but would not be offering a preferred route until mid 1986 at the earliest. Any such route would be subject to public comment. It was thus far too early to make any categoric statement about an alignment.

Residents in Seacombe Heights should treat with a great deal of suspicion any statements about Highways Department intentions made by Mr Brown or his colleague Mr Mathwin. Mr Brown had offered what he said was the route proposed by the Liberals. This was a laughable dotted line with a thick felt tipped pen across a road map. Mr Keneally said he expected that Mr Brown would respond by stating that a detailed map of Government intentions had been in the possession of Mrs June Appleby, MP for Brighton. It was true that a map had been provided to Mrs Appleby by the Highways Department. It was however conceptual only and was intended to give a general indication of the possible route. Yet, even this concept plan did not show the third arterial running through the middle of Seacombe Heights.

All honourable members would be able to understand from that that at no time did I say, as a direct quote, that the member for Davenport claimed to have obtained the map from the Labor member for Brighton and that that map had been sketched out as a concept plan only to give some indication of the traffic control possibilities. I did not say that. I have no need to apologise. I did not accuse the honourable member of going into my colleague's office and getting a copy of the map. I know that she would have too much sense to fall for such a trick, even if the member for Davenport was so foolish as to try to pull it off.

My press statement was clear. The way it was dealt with by the *News* is something for which the *News* should answer. I have no apologies to make—I am clear in the statement that I issued. That statement is now on the record for all members to see, and for anyone else who wants to know the truth of what was said, including the member for Davenport.

Mrs APPLEBY (Brighton): I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

Mrs APPLEBY: In the explanation (I presume you would call it) by the member for Davenport, he referred to someone ringing my office yesterday afternoon, which is correct as two people did ring, seeking a map that I had in my office and a photocopy of it. My staff acted under full orders as they had been instructed that no map of any description was to be given to the public without an explanation of the processes of the requirements. Therefore, I resent the reference by the member for Davenport to my staff acting as they did.

The Hon. TED CHAPMAN (Alexandra): I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

The Hon. TED CHAPMAN: During the latter part of Question Time and, indeed, in the period—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. TED CHAPMAN: —during which the matter of Seacombe Heights concerns were being canvassed by way of question and answer in the House, I interjected indicating my presence in that region in recent time. In response to that interjection quite a stream of abuse came from a member on the other side of the House who does not happen to be present in the Chamber at the moment. However, I am sure, as a result of picking up that stream of abuse, that the details and comments actually made will be recorded in *Hansard.*

However, in explanation, briefly, my position is that I was in the area two weeks ago on a number of days during that period. I was in the Alpine Way region of Seacombe Heights when residents raised the southern freeway subject. I was told by householder after householder that they believed, as a result of phone calls made to the Highways Department and the advice they had received, that the Labor Party spurline was coming down the ridge adjacent to their homes, in some cases specifically through the homes, through the garden, adjacent to the back fence, and so on. Messages of that kind were being conveyed repeatedly.

It has nothing to do with me personally, as it is right out of my district and totally divorced from my shadow portfolio. My interjection today did not deserve the sort of abuse and response that came from the other side. The opportunity to explain my position is relevant, appropriate and fair in view of the remarks made. It is a matter of fact that not only was I there but that, indeed, as explained, that was the nature of complaint coming from the area based, rightly or wrongly—

Ms LENEHAN: On a point of order, Mr Speaker, I seek clarification. The honourable member claims that he is explaining—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I cannot hear the point of order being taken.

Ms LENEHAN: What are the allegations to which the member for Alexandra refers when he claims to have been misrepresented? He has not told the House where he has been misrepresented.

The SPEAKER: There is no point of order. It is undesirable to start giving hypothetical clarifications. As I understand the situation, the honourable member, in his own fashion, is explaining to the House that he has been misrepresented. I ask the honourable member to proceed along with the matter and finalise it within Standing Orders.

The Hon. TED CHAPMAN: Far be it from me to take up the time of the House on this issue: I have said all I need to say. I do not propose to repeat the remarks made by the honourable member opposite during Question Time when I interjected. What I have done, and done appropriately, is to put on the record a situation that led to my interjection, identify my part in this scene, and report the facts—not the abuse or the allegations made from the other side of the House. I have referred to the facts relating to the concerns of the community about which the subject has been well and truly canvassed and established on this side of the House.

Mr TRAINER (Ascot Park): I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

Mr TRAINER: I will try to keep my explanation shorter than some to date. The member for Davenport implied that a conversation that I related to the House concerning a constituent of mine who had contacted him did in fact not take place and by imputation—

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr TRAINER: —by imputation, there was an implication that I was being untruthful. The member for Davenport then slightly—

Members interjecting:

Mr TRAINER: I deny that there was any untruth in the statement I made to the House. I have been completely truthful, and the conversation as related to the House did take place. The member for Davenport then implied that I had had untruths relayed to me. I will relay that back to the constituent concerned.

INDUSTRIAL CONCILIATION AND ARBITRATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL (No. 2)

Mr MATHWIN (Glenelg) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Act 1972. Read a first time.

Mr MATHWIN: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

It will amend section 134 of the principal Act, and I seek the full support of all members on both sides of the House in the name of fair play and what is right. Is it right that money or financial reward be automatically taken from the pay packet for trade union funds? I have no argument with the fact that money is paid to the trade unions from the pay packet by arrangement between the employers, employees and the unions concerned. However, I certainly have an argument in relation to the fact that a portion of that is ripped off and paid into the Labor Party funds.

That is where I disagree with the present situation. It is quite wrong that no questions are asked regarding taking part of this trade union contribution. One is not asked whether one objects to it. One must make the move to either stop the action or allow it to continue. In other words, if one wishes to have one's money back, to stop that payment to the Labor Party, one must ask them to stop payment of sustentation fee to Labor Party funds. That is the wrong way about; it is the cart before the horse. That would be called, 'opting out'. The right and fair way to do this is to allow workers to 'opt in'. They do not opt out or have it stopped. If they do not wish to pay it to the Labor Party funds, they have to approach the trade union secretary, shop steward or whoever it may be and say, 'I do not wish to pay this sustentation fee to the Labor Party'.

Mr Groom interjecting:

Mr MATHWIN: I will deal with the budding Minister. The member for Hartley has now left his move too close to the election, and I do not think he will make it. Seriously, people should have the opportunity to say whether they wish to have part of their wages given to the Labor Party. That is fair, and surely the member for Hartley, who in my estimation up to this point is a very fair man, who has a wide vision, when he thinks about this, tossing and turning in his bed tonight, will say, 'Yes, John, the member for Glenelg, was right.'

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I understand that the honourable member for Glenelg is speaking in a second reading debate on the presentation of a Bill. The Chair hopes that the honourable member can link up the member for Hartley with some clause or other. Otherwise, the member for Glenelg would be obviously out of order, and the Chair would ask the member for Glenelg to come back to the Bill.

Mr MATHWIN: I do admit I have not included the honourable member by name. I was dealing with the fairness of the situation. Let us see what the rules of the Labor Party are in relation to this matter. We are talking about sustentation fees and political levies. If the honourable member and the House wish me to read the Bill first, I will do so. However, it is normal to go through the Bill, clause by clause, after some explanation of it is given. In relation to sustentation fees, the Labor Party rules state:

> The sustentation fee is currently $1.90 per annum for each effective member on the union books, as long as that member is not a member of any other political Party or auxiliary.

I wonder how fair that is. It means that if any worker in South Australia is not a member of any political Party, they automatically, as far as the Labor Party is concerned—

Mr Hamilton interjecting:

Mr MATHWIN: The honourable member for Albert Park says that I am wrong, but I have received this information from his headquarters and his bosses on South Terrace. If that is the situation, they would expect a person to be a member of a political Party. Other than that, they are roped into the net to make a financial contribution to the Labor Party. On face value (and I am sure members would agree with me), that is unfair.

If one is not a member of a political Party, one must join the Labor Party. However, they will let one in cheap, because it goes on to say what the sustentation fees and membership

fees are. I understand that the membership fee varies from $5 to $20 per member. This amount of $4.30 is transferred to the head office in a form of a sustentation fee. In other words, the people concerned are getting the privilege of being a member of and affiliated with the Labor Party on the cheap for $4.50.

However, that is not the basis of my argument, which is that it is grossly unfair to stop this payment being made. The worker concerned must approach the officials and say, 'I do not want to join it. I do not want to become affiliated with the Labor Party. That is quite wrong. That is the situation with respect to the Labor Party rule book.

Clause 1 of the Bill is formal, and clause 2 is the main clause which inserts new section 134 subsection (1) of which provides as follows:

Notwithstanding any other provisions of this Act, an association shall not be registered under this Part unless the rules of the association provide that the association shall not make any payment to, or for the benefit of, any political organisation other than a payment of an amount being a proportion of the membership fee of a member of the association who, on paying the membership fee, consented in writing to the payment of that proportion of the membership fee to a political organisation.

In other words, this Bill will indicate to the responsible person within the union organisation that it is a person's right not to join if he desires not to do so. However, it is fair that persons can become involved. If members are getting benefits from the trade union organisation, it is their right to join. I have no argument with that at all, because that has to be paid for, and it is a privilege for persons to belong to their union, as I was in my own situation before coming to Australia. They held two minutes silence for me at the union meeting I attended in order to get my clearance when leaving the United Kingdom. When a person pays his union dues originally, he should sign a form stating that he desires a sustentation fee to be deducted from his wages or from his money that is going to the union.

I believe that it is fair and just that people should have a right to be in command of their own wages. People have a right to say where their money should go. A worker is perfectly entitled to pay to a union a joining fee or a membership fee, but equally he has the right to determine whether or not a portion of that fee should go to the Labor Party. A worker should have the right to determine whether he wants to be affiliated with the Labor Party or be involved with it. It should not occur automatically.

This Bill gives a person the right to make a choice about being affiliated with the Labor Party. It is quite wrong for people to be forced into this, and people should not be told that, whether they like it or not, they will be affiliated with a political Party. Subsection (2) of proposed new section 134a provides that:

Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, on and after the first day of January, 1986, the rules of every registered association (whether registered before or after the commencement of the Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Act Amendment Act (No. 2), 1985 must provide that the association shall not make any payment to, or for the benefit of, any political organisation other than a payment of an amount being a proportion of the membership fee of a member of the association who, on paying the membership fee, consented—

and this is the crux of the matter—

in writing to the payment of that proportion of the membership fee to a political organisation.

That is fair. A worker is thus given the choice of whether or not his union pays an affiliation fee or a sustentation fee from his subscription to, say, the Liberal Party. Maybe the unions would be glad to pass on some financial assistance to the Liberal Party—after all the Liberal Party has done quite a bit for the unions over the years. Certainly, the greatest strides that the union movements ever took in the late 1800s in the United Kingdom came from right of centre politics. Most of the unions were given the right to strike and the right to picket by right of centre governments, and not left of centre governments. So, those in the union movements do hold a certain allegiance to the equivalent of the Liberal Party in relation to union activities undertaken previously. This proposed new section lays out the rules pretty stringently. Subsection (3) of proposed new section 134a provides that:

This section does not apply to an association or a registered association that is registered under the Conciliation and Arbitration Act 1904 of the Commonwealth, or is a branch, or forms part, of any organisation so registered.

In other words, these provisions relate to the local scene, and it is a local problem. I think the Bill is fair, and I see nothing wrong with it. It gives workers the right to do as they wish with their financial reward for working, their wages. Being a realist, one must say, 'All right, what is the real reason behind it?' There are, I believe, two aspects: on the one hand is a matter of power and numbers and, on the other hand, a matter of financial benefit. I am referring to financial benefit to the Labor Party, which indeed derives a fair amount of money from this arrangement. It is all very well to say that $4.30 is not very much, but, when considering 8 000, 10 000 or 15 000 affiliated members in a union, the total amount runs into a fair amount of money. If a person does not belong to another political party, that is all right, because they can join the Labor Party. One aspect is the financial benefit to the Labor Party.

If one wanted to be naughty one could refer to the policy of the Labor Party which demands compulsory unionism. It is quite simple to put the two together. It would be advantageous to a Labor Government to force all workers to join a union. They know that there are not many workers who are members of political organisations. The unions also know damn well that, if those involved are not members of such an organisation, they can get them for the sustentation fee at $4.30 a head. It is not a bad lurk, but it is unfair. That is the financial aspect of it if one wants to look at it that way.

I would balance this by considering in what other areas there is an advantage. One then considers the power aspect, and one can consider the trade union movement and its delegates at conferences of the Labor Party. The number of people that they have who are affiliated members of the Labor Party in this manner of sustentation fees and the like gives them the voting power of many thousands of people. So, in comparison with the rank and file of members of the Labor Party in the branches and other organisations within the State, the others have no show at all in a combat between one area and another in relation to voting powers. This is because the representatives from various unions demand and command a vast number of votes when putting their hands up to vote on various issues at their conferences and the like and, of course, this directs policy. The power of the trade union movement in directing Labor Party policy then comes to the fore.

In looking at it in that light, we can see what will happen. I understand from people who have talked to me about the matter that instances have occurred where more members are put down than the number actually worked out in some unions on a percentage basis. For example, a union might have 8 000 or 10 000 members; they work out a percentage and determine that, instead of having 10 000 members, they will make it 8 000 or 7 500. But, that is a bit of guess work, anyway. They may decide to give a bit of leeway, but, when working it out, one realises that it is a fair lump of voting power, which gives a fair bit of muscle to members representing the unions that wish to operate under that method—although not all do.

Members interjecting:

Mr MATHWIN: It is all right for the member for Henley Beach to have a seizure. But, I am telling the truth, and the honourable member would know that there are cases where muscle and power has been used to dictate certain aspects of policy. One must look at the situation in relation to the financial advantage involved and the policy muscle which gives a certain great advantage to the union bosses of the Party, because they can then exercise muscle and power.

I would like to know, as would other members, what checks there have been on numbers. I am sure that the arrangement is very loose in certain respects. I ask members to question what is fair and right in terms of the Bill. If the answer is that it should be fair, the person concerned has the right to say, 'If I wish to belong to or be affiliated with the Labor Party, you can stop a certain sum from my pay packet': it should not be done automatically.

Even if a person belongs to a political organisation, it is unfair to be dragged into the net. We all know that many people have sympathies with either the Labor Party or the Liberal Party, but it is wrong for them all to be dragged into the net, thus giving a financial advantage to the Labor Party. I ask members to look at the Bill in that light: is it fair for a person to have the right to opt out from paying, or should that person automatically be co-opted?

Mr GREGORY secured the adjournment of the debate.

MARGINAL LANDS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Mr GUNN (Eyre) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Marginal Lands Act 1940. Read a first time.

Mr GUNN: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

Its purpose is to afford people who currently hold land under marginal perpetual lease the same rights as people who have Crown perpetual leases. The Marginal Lands Act was originally introduced to solve some difficulties when land in marginal areas of the State was first cut up into smaller blocks. They were not economic: the land has been over farmed and grazed and has tended to drift.

However, the need for that course of action has long since passed. In many cases, people hold land on freehold title and perpetual lease and also operate marginal leases. In the Opposition's view, the most effective form of land title is freehold, and those people should all be encouraged to freehold their marginal leases.

My Bill allows them to do so on the same basis as people who currently hold Crown perpetual leases, and that is in the interests of Government efficiency within the Department of Lands, as it will streamline operations and save taxpayers' money. Therefore, I commend the Bill to the House.

The Hon. R.G. PAYNE secured the adjournment of the debate.

PITJANTJATJARA LAND RIGHTS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Mr GUNN (Eyre) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Pitjantjatjara Land Rights Act 1981. Read a first time.

Mr GUNN: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

Its purpose is to bring the Pitjantjatjara land rights legislation into line with legislation introduced earlier in this Parliament granting freehold title to the Maralinga lands. The reasons for this have been canvassed on many occasions in this House. However, in view of problems that have occurred since granting the land rights under legislation of the Tonkin Government, it is clear to anyone who sits back and looks at the present situation with a clear and open mind that amendments to the Pitjantjatjara Land Rights Act are long overdue.

We had all the debates, discussions and arguments during the Select Committee considerations of the Maralinga lands. If anyone takes the trouble to read the evidence given to that inquiry, they would have to come to the firm conclusion that the Pitjantjatjara legislation is in urgent need of amendment. Common sense should apply: but there is no common sense applying when people in South Australia or elsewhere in Australia wanting permission to travel through a part of South Australia have to apply to Alice Springs for a permit.

There is no common sense or justice when law abiding citizens of this State are not allowed to drive on what would normally be designated roads. All roads in the Pitjantjatjara land should be surveyed and placed under the Highways Act. Law abiding citizens should have the right to drive on those roads on the same basis as applies under the Maralinga legislation. I could make a lengthy speech on this matter, but I did so previously, I believe that if these amendments are accepted the land rights debate can get down to a sensible and informed discussion.

Recent decisions of the Federal Government and Mr Holding will do nothing to improve race relations, enhance the standing of Aboriginal people or assist them whatsoever. It is a foolish and naive attempt by Mr Holding. Recently, a map appeared in the *Australian* in relation to this matter. Also, an article appeared in the *News* on Thursday 29 August 1985, headed 'Land rights "to cost 25 per cent",' which reads:

> More than 25 per cent of the Australian continent could be subject to claim by Aborigines if the Federal Government goes ahead with its plans for national land rights legislation. A detailed computer analysis of the Commonwealth's 'preferred model' shows that South Australia, Western Australia, the Northern Territory and Tasmania stand to lose most.
>
> Even in Victoria a section of the eastern corner of the State could be barred to entry by white Australians if the plans become law. The analysis, prepared by commercial interests in Western Australia, was obtained by the *Australian* newspaper and comes after publication yesterday in the *News* and the *Australian* of a confidential national opinion poll commissioned by the Federal Government which shows that less than one in five Australians strongly supports Aboriginal land rights. Also obtained by the *Australian* was a confidential letter written by the Aboriginal Affairs Department which warns land rights is stirring 'latent racism' within the community.
>
> The letter is a detailed briefing of a proposal to spend $1.5 million on a national advertising campaign to promote land rights and the need for Aboriginal advancement. The maps, which were not associated with the letter, show Queensland would be the State least affected by the proposed legislation.
>
> Under the terms of the plan only existing Aboriginal reserves, national parks and vacant Crown land would be open to claim. In Queensland, most land is either classified freehold or as pastoral leases, and as such it is automatically exempt. Close examination of the maps show much of the areas that could be claimed cover regions that may become crucial to the nation's future property. A spokesman for the Federal Aboriginal Affairs Minister, Mr Holding, said the Government had decided not to proceed with the large scale public information campaign.

That article, in my view, clearly explains why it is essential that we get right the model of land rights operating in South Australia. The Pitjantjatjara land rights legislation was the first attempt by a State Government to give some recognition to the aspirations and rights of indigenous Aboriginal people.

That matter took a great deal of time. However, since that legislation came into operation, certain elements attaching themselves to the concerns of Aboriginal people have set out to make the legislation unworkable. Undertakings and opinions given on how this legislation would affect

mining and exploration and the rights of ordinary law-abiding citizens have not stood the test of time, and it is therefore necessary to keep these matters under constant review. That first review was when legislation was introduced to grant land rights to the Maralinga people, and the model that followed from that exercise changed the situation. It was realistic and, although there are some problems with it, I believe that the legislation should be uniform within this State. This Bill would bring the Pitjantjatjara lands in line with the Maralinga lands.

I am confident, no matter what the Government does on this occasion, that these amendments will, in the very near future, receive the support of the House. It is only a matter of time before the barrier comes down, and I do not believe that the people of this State or nation will tolerate a situation where law-abiding people are barred from travelling through large sections of land. It is an intolerable situation and, no matter how much the extreme left wing elements, the political radicals or other so-called spokespeople for the Aboriginal movement jump up and down and publicly castigate people like me, it will be to no avail, because the public will not tolerate land rights legislation that is not soundly based and not fair and just. I therefore seek leave to have the formal part of my speech inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

Explanation of Clauses

Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 makes a consequential amendment to the arrangement section of the principal Act. Clause 3 places new definitions in the interpretive section. The first definition is of 'exploratory operations', being prospecting or exploring for minerals under the Mining Act, 1971, or exploring for petroleum under the Petroleum Act, 1940, and the second definition is of 'sacred site', being part of the lands that are of fundamental importance to the traditional owners.

Clause 4 inserts a new Division 1A relating to a register of sacred sites. The provision would enable Anangu Pitjantjatjaraku to identify sites on a register and prevent unauthorised disclosure. The register would be relevant to an application to explore or mine upon the lands.

Clause 5 proposes an amendment to section 19 of the principal Act and would require Anangu Pitjantjatjaraku to provide the reasons for a refusal of an application for permission to enter the lands.

Clause 6 amends section 20 of the principal Act so that the provision would be similar to a comparable provision in the Maralinga Land Rights Act, 1984. Proposed new subsection (9) requires the Minister of Mines and Energy to confer with the Minister of Aboriginal Affairs and the parties in an effort to resolve a deadlock. An arbitrator may finally be appointed. Under subsection (11), the arbitrator would be either a Judge of the Supreme Court or a legal practitioner of ten years standing when the application related to the carrying out of exploratory operations or a Judge of the High Court, Federal Court or Supreme Court, or practitioner of 10 years standing when the application was for actual mining.

Clause 7 inserts a new section 20a in the principal Act. It is similar to a provision in the Maralinga Land Rights Act 1984. The effect of the provision would be that upon an application for a mining tenement in respect of a part of the lands, the Minister of Mines and Energy and the Minister of Aboriginal Affairs would consult with Anangu Pitjantjatjaraku to determine whether a sacred site on the register would be affected. If so, steps could be taken to preserve the sacred site.

Clause 8 proposes amendments to section 21 of the principal Act by striking out subsections (4), (5) and (6) and replacing them with a new subsection (4) similar to a provision in the Maralinga Land Rights Act 1984. The new subsection is intended to specify clearly the payments that may be made to Anangu Pitjantjatjaraku and those that may not.

Clause 9 relates to that section of the principal Act that regulates payments made to Anangu Pitjantjatjaraku in respect of mining operations on the lands. The amendment would restrict payments made in respect of exploratory operations to those that are or would become payable under the Mining Act 1971 or the Petroleum Act 1940.

Clauses 10 to 13 relate to roads that are to be delineated by a map that is to be incorporated into the Act. These roads are to be given the same status as the Stuart Highway and the Oodnadatta to Granite Downs road.

Clause 14 provides for a new section 34a that would provide that road works carried out upon roads comprising road reserves are to be considered as road works upon roads within the meaning of the Highways Act 1926. The provision would effectively allow the Commissioner to expend moneys held under that Act on roads that are on the lands. A similar provision appears in the Maralinga Land Rights Act 1984.

Clause 15 inserts new sections 42a and 42b. Section 42a is intended to overcome any argument that might be raised that because there exist restrictions upon access to the lands any particular part of the lands does not constitute a public place. It also provides that the Road Traffic Act 1961 and the Motor Vehicles Act 1959 apply in relation to roads on the lands. Section 42b applies regulations under the Pastoral Act 1936 to any depasturing of stock upon the lands.

Clause 16 inserts a new paragraph in the regulation-making powers of the Act. The paragraph provides for the creation of a model form of agreement that could form the basis of negotiations between Anangu Pitjantjatjaraku and an applicant seeking to carry out exploratory operations upon the lands. Similar provision was made in the Maralinga Land Rights Act 1984. A regulation providing for such an agreement could only be made with the approval of Anangu Pitjantjatjaraku.

Clause 17 provides for the insertion of a new schedule to the Act that would define various roads for the purpose of other amendments of this Bill.

The Hon. R.G. PAYNE secured the adjournment of the debate.

LAND ACQUISITION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Mr GUNN (Eyre) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Land Acquisition Act 1969. Read a first time.

Mr GUNN: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

This Bill is identical to one which I introduced in the last session giving people who have had their land compulsorily acquired by the Government the opportunity to appeal against the actual decision to compulsorily acquire. In view of the fact that a number of people have been very badly treated by Governments and Government departments when land has been compulsorily acquired, I believe it is a course of action that is long overdue.

I do not know if the House is aware that, once a notice is served on a person, that person loses all rights relating to that land. He can argue only about the price, and in today's climate that is quite unacceptable. At least the Minister or the Government department in question should be

held accountable and the persons concerned should have the opportunity to strongly defend their right to oppose that course of action. As I understand it, where there is a weak Minister, a Government officer who cannot get his own way at negotiations just puts a compulsory acquisition document in front of the Minister and he will sign it. The person involved is then completely divested of his or her rights in the matter, and that is quite an unfair situation. I therefore commend the Bill to the House as a fair and reasonable measure that is long overdue.

The Hon. R.G. PAYNE secured the adjournment of the debate.

CASINO ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Mr M.J. EVANS (Elizabeth) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Casino Act 1983. Read a first time.

Mr M.J. EVANS: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

When this Parliament approved the establishment of a casino in South Australia, it also moved to exclude poker machines from that casino. I have always considered this to be a significant anomaly which is not easily sustained in logic. Since 1983, when the Bill was passed, I believe that the community attitude to such matters has shifted further in favour of the casino in general and the inclusion of poker machines in particular. Certainly I believe this to be the case in my own electorate. The Act does not exclude any other form of gambling, and the State already operates instant money tickets and permits the sale of bingo tickets which are indistinguishable in their principle of operation from the poker machines which are excluded from the casino.

Since then, this Parliament has also extended the operations of the TAB to include Footy Bet, and betting on the result of a certain running race has also been legalised. Poker machines also have the advantage that they reduce the minimum unit bet which is available. Many of the traditional casino games have significant minimum bet requirements. Poker machines operate on a 20 cent coin or less. It is possible to play the machines over a significant period with a comparatively small investment. They are also far less intimidating than many of the other games, such as blackjack, which require the player to master complex rules and involve interaction with the croupier and other players. Many people, including myself, find this kind of game to be far too serious a business.

Many ordinary South Australians do not wish to involve themselves in sophisticated gambling: they simply wish to have a small flutter without being intimidated. There is also the question of the significant number of people who make the long journey interstate in order to participate in the atmosphere which the poker machines generate. The State is losing thousands of dollars in this way, and I want to see this money retained in South Australia.

The effects of this Bill are confined to the casino. It is not the thin edge of the wedge for the general introduction of poker machines throughout the State. The casino is by definition a unique establishment in legal terms, and there is no more reason to expect that legalisation of poker machines in the casino will lead to their general introduction than to predict that two-up will be legalised simply because it will be legal in the casino. I ask honourable members to consider the Bill on its merits and not on the basis of an emotive and inaccurate translation of the New South Wales position to South Australia.

Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 amends section 4 of the principal Act by deleting reference to poker machines in the definition of 'terms'. Clause 3 repeals section 25 of the Act. I commend the Bill to the House.

The Hon. R.G. PAYNE secured the adjournment of the debate.

SELECT COMMITTEE OF INQUIRY INTO STEAMTOWN PETERBOROUGH RAILWAY PRESERVATION SOCIETY LIMITED

Mr TRAINER (Ascot Park): I move:

That the time for bringing up the report of the select committee be extended to 23 October 1985.

Motion carried.

HALLETT COVE SERVICE STATION

Adjourned debate on motion of Mr Mathwin:

That this House requests the Government to alleviate the unfair situation which prevails concerning the Shell Service Station situated on the corner of Lonsdale Highway and Ramrod Road, Hallett Cove, by invoking section 17 of the Shop Trading Hours Act 1977 to allow this service station unrestricted hours of trading for the sale of fuel, oil, lubricants, etc.

(Continued from 18 September. Page 1013.)

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD (Deputy Premier): I oppose the motion. In moving it, the member for Glenelg said that in recent times this matter had been referred to two Ministers of Labour (the Hon. Jack Wright and the Hon. Frank Blevins), and that both had rejected the overture. One must have some sympathy for the situation in which the proprietor of this service station finds himself or herself. The regulations as they operate follow local government boundaries, and those boundaries do not necessarily reflect the philosophy that lies behind the desire of the industry to have regulation in certain parts of what is now regarded as the metropolitan area and no regulation outside it.

That is something about which we are concerned. The Hon. Jack Wright and the Hon. Frank Blevins have made perfectly clear to the industry that, if it can agree on a deregulation package, the Government will be only too happy to oblige. However, until the industry can come to a declared position on this matter, we do not believe that the Government should move.

That clearly leaves anomalies of which this is one. I know this area extremely well. For many years I represented it in this place. Technically, because of the way in which the boundaries are drawn, this area comes within the present district of my colleague the member for Mawson. However, my district is not so far away and my home is probably within sight of the area if one could get a little elevation. There is little doubt that what the member for Glenelg said is correct: the area is more remote from the GPO, as the crow flies, than is the so-called 'mad mile' of service stations at Darlington.

Mr Mathwin: You mean 'gasoline alley'.

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: Yes. Because the service stations at Darlington lie within the area of the city of Happy Valley, they are subject to no regulations as to opening and closing. As I see it, the problem is that the Hallett Cove area is not the only area that is subject to this form of anomaly. Indeed, anomalies abound. One case in particular, of an anomaly that was resolved, is raised from time to time and concerns the two service stations at Eagle on the Hill. These service stations were next to each other

but in different local government areas: one was in Stirling, the other is in Burnside. In those circumstances, one was under regulation and one was not. To make matters worse, the effect of one being under regulation meant that a dangerous traffic pattern was established at that point as a result of people making U-turns on the highway. Therefore, the member for Davenport, as Minister in the previous Government, exercised his powers under section 17 of the Shop Trading Hours Act, and the outlet in the Burnside district was accordingly deregulated.

Mr S.G. Evans: It took eight years of representation by a member before that happened.

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: I appreciate that, as the honourable member says, the battle was long and hard before an outcome was reached. However, that situation does not apply to the Hallett Cove outlet. Lonsdale Highway is busy, but it is a moot point whether the more restricted hours have led to a more congested traffic pattern on that highway or whether the extended hours would mean that people would be moving on and off the carriageway at certain times, for instance late at night, thus causing greater traffic problems. Therefore, I do not know that the traffic issue is relevant. Indeed, that was not the way in which the motion was argued by the member for Glenelg: he simply argued the anomaly as it exists.

I can only repeat, perhaps with some degree of sadness in having to oppose the motion, that there is a series of similar situations that would have to be examined seriously if we were to grant deregulation in this circumstance. That is not meant to detract from the Government's desire to see deregulation if only the industry will come forward with a package. This has been subject to much discussion for many years. It was touched on, but not proceeded with, in relation to the famous shopping hours debate of 1971.

The Hon. B.C. Eastick: They were heady days.

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: Yes, when the young Turks of 1970 on both sides had their mettle tested. It is with some reluctance that I urge the House to reject the motion, but I make the point strongly that such anomalies need to be resolved on an overall basis. That will occur only when the industry is prepared to come to the Government and put an argument on the basis of an industry-wide agreement.

Mr OSWALD (Morphett): It is interesting to hear that the Government is prepared to deregulate petrol trading hours if the industry agrees. It is also interesting to hear that there are anomalies to which the Government admits. Indeed, we are all aware of those anomalies. The member for Glenelg, shortly to become the member for Bright, is doing the right thing in bringing this matter before the House. Residents of the area need access to 24-hour petrol at the Shell station to which he refers.

In the past, Governments were happy to invoke section 17 of the Shop Trading Hours Act when they saw an anomaly or where it was convenient to grant compensation at such places as Cavan. I see no reason why a petrol station at Cavan (10 kilometres from the GPO), at Darlington (13 kilometres from the GPO), or at Holden Hill (10 kilometres from the GPO) should all be allowed to trade out of ordinary hours, yet this service station at Hallett Cove, which is 22.2 kilometres from the GPO, is not allowed to do so because of the peculiarity of its geography.

I will not go into the philosophy in which I believe, namely, that if a businessman puts his money and his risk capital into a venture, he should be allowed to open whatever hours he chooses. That is my personal philosophy and is on the record, but that does not come into this debate. The honourable member is justified in the request he is putting forward and in seeking the support of this Parliament to bring that about. I believe that the Government is in a position where, if it wants to decide that that anomaly does exist, the residents of that suburb in the vicinity of the Shell station could get some additional after-hours service.

It is a logical move on the part of a member who is showing extreme concern and interest for residents in the area. The member for Glenelg is to be applauded on the interest he is showing in his future constituents in that part of the electorate. I support his motion and would be delighted if the Shell station in the area was able to trade on a 24-hour basis. The subject of drawing the industry together so that we can have extended hours is another subject not within the wording of this Bill. If that came about I would be very sympathetic towards supporting it. I seek leave to continue my remarks later.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

ELECTRICITY SURCHARGE

Adjourned debate on the motion of Mr Gunn:

That, in the opinion of the House, the Government should immediately abolish the 10 per cent electricity surcharge which applies to certain parts of the State and institute an electricity pricing policy in which all citizens of South Australia are charged on the same basis and further, the House condemns the Government for its failure to implement a fair and equitable system of charging for electricity in country areas.

(Continued from 18 September. Page 1013.)

Mr GUNN (Eyre): I conclude my remarks by saying that I sincerely hope that, in implementing the policy, the Government will ensure that people's jobs are not put at risk and that they are not forced to shift from their current residence to another town in order to continue employment in the industry with which they have been involved for a considerable time. I also ask the Minister to enter into discussions with other councils that at this stage have not been included in the proposal that exempts the people on Upper Eyre Peninsula from the 10 per cent surcharge and allow other areas of the State to enter into negotiations with councils to see if they want to come under the arrangements announced by Government some time ago. I commend the motion and ask the House to support it.

The Hon. R.G. PAYNE secured the adjournment of the debate.

DEREGULATION OF HOUSING INTEREST RATES

Adjourned debate on the motion of Ms Lenehan:

That this House—

(a) expresses its strong opposition to the Liberal Party's proposals for the deregulation of housing interest rates;

(b) strongly supports the maintenance of the ceiling on housing interest rates; and

(c) urges the Federal Government to reject calls for deregulation and to maintain the ceiling on housing interest rates:

(Continued from 18 September. Page 1015.)

Ms LENEHAN (Mawson): I conclude my remarks by briefly recounting some of the points I made in moving this motion calling on the Federal Government—

Mr Gunn: Repetition is out of order.

Ms LENEHAN: I am summarising rather than repeating. The motion calls on the Federal Government to reject calls for deregulation of housing interest rates and to maintain the ceiling on housing interest rates. The motion also expresses its strong opposition to the Liberal Party's proposals for deregulation of housing interest rates. It is impor-

tant that I recall for the House a couple of very salient points I made in refuting the arguments put forward by the Martin and Campbell committees regarding housing interest rates deregulation.

I quoted a very comprehensive article by Tony Nippard called 'Campbell, Martin and housing finance regulation—a review of the debate'. I also made points very strongly based on this article that, in fact, one of the conclusions of both committees was that, as long as housing interest rates were regulated, savings deposits would continue to attract relatively low interest rates and as a result low income earners were being disadvantaged by regulation. Nippard argued that a large proportion of these low income groups (and the latest demographic figures that I studied this morning would support this when we are moving more to an ageing population) are aged couples who have benefited from low housing interest rates in the past.

Another important point made is that the recent data that has come from the Victorian survey on housing loan applicants shows that a higher proportion of low income earners were gaining housing loans. Apparently 20 per cent of bank borrowers had incomes below the average weekly earnings, compared to 13 per cent shown in the Campbell committee's data. Nippard also argued that low income borrowers are not excluded from low interest avenues but that to the degree that other borrowers also have access to relatively cheap finance, regulation can be used or be seen as a blunt instrument in providing finance for a target group of low income earners.

I will not canvass all the arguments I put to the House in moving the motion to oppose the deregulation of housing interest rates, but I would like to highlight Mr Howard's policy. There has been procrastination backwards and forwards by the Leader of the Opposition and we have not had a categorical statement on whether he is supporting the Government or supporting my motion in calling on the Federal Government not to remove the ceilings for housing interest rates. So, we can only assume that the Leader of the Opposition is supporting his federal colleagues and the Federal Leader, Mr Howard. We all know that Mr Howard is an economic rationalist, that he supports the Friedmanite and Thatcherite policies—the policies that are wreaking destruction on Britain—policies of privatisation, policies of deregulation, and policies that can only lead not to the creation of extra jobs and not to more people obtaining their own homes and providing greater housing but rather only to a cycle of poverty. We have seen some of the results of that cycle of poverty. I will not elaborate, as every member of the House knows to what I am referring.

If we have a system being promoted by John Howard where housing interest rates are allowed to be governed by the same market forces that are now the general interest rate in Australia, I put to this House that we are going to be looking at housing interest rates, under the present system, of between 15 and 20 per cent. Will anyone seriously go out to their electorate and support that? Will the member for Todd go to his electorate and say that he will support a proposal that will mean that people will be paying between 15 to 20 per cent? Is that what the honourable member will say? Is he going to support the Federal Liberal Party policy? What is he going to support? It will be interesting to hear what the member for Todd has to say. I am sure it will be enlightening.

The Hon. R.G. Payne interjecting:

Ms LENEHAN: No, it will not be, but it will be interesting to hear.

Mr Ashenden interjecting:

Ms LENEHAN: I am used to threats by the Opposition. I have been threatened by members of the Opposition ever since I came into this House. Members can threaten me until they are blue in the face: I will not be intimidated by members of the Opposition who wish to threaten me on any issue. That is fine—let them go ahead, and let them also refute the evidence that I have put to this House in respect of reports I have looked at. Let the member for Todd be on the public record supporting deregulation of housing interest rates.

Let him be on the public record saying to the people of South Australia that not only does he support that, but that he is happy to see people lose their homes. How well I remember the period from 1979 to 1982. As a candidate, I doorknocked over 5 000 doors in my electorate of Mawson, and in every street there was an empty house where somebody had been driven from their home by the policies of the then Governments in both the Federal and State arenas. Many of those people are now permanent residents in a caravan park in my area.

Many of those people are now living in Housing Trust accommodation because they lost their own homes. Not one shred of humanity was shown to them by my opponent, by the then Premier or by any member of the Opposition. If members opposite take that policy to the people at the next election, they are in for a shock. One area about which I know something is housing interest rates—it is an issue with which I am very conversant.

Mr Ashenden interjecting:

Ms LENEHAN: We will see what happens. Yesterday the Opposition moved a motion in this House condemning the Premier for his actions. No doubt members opposite say that we should deregulate, that we should throw people into the streets and that we should not worry about housing as an issue. That is fine for the Opposition, but we will go to the people on our housing record. The Minister of Housing and Construction very coherently spelt out our housing record yesterday. It is second to none in this State, and members opposite know that. They know very well that we have the best housing record of any State in this country. If members opposite do not believe that, they should talk to people in other States who are involved in public housing authorities. Last year there was a national housing conference, and delegates from interstate were full of praise for our housing policy. I think the Opposition should think very carefully before it attacks the Bannon Government on its housing record.

Mr Ashenden: Ha, ha!

Ms LENEHAN: The member for Todd may laugh, but we will see who has the last laugh. The member for Todd will not be present in this House following the next election. In conclusion, I believe that all members on this side of the House will support my motion, which opposes the Liberal Party's policy to deregulate housing interest rates. All members on this side believe passionately that they should be supported by a Government to the best of its ability so that people can retain their homes. My motion also calls on our federal colleagues to ensure that housing interest rates are not deregulated.

Mr ASHENDEN (Todd): We have just seen one of the most remarkable pieces of posturing by a member of Parliament and the greatest shedding of crocodile tears that I have witnessed in the six years that I have been a member of this House.

Mr Trainer: And six years is your limit.

Mr ASHENDEN: I hope that that interjection has been recorded, because I would like a dollar for every time that members of the then Opposition said during 1979-82 that I would not be returned following the next election. That was not the case, and I am quite happy for members opposite to keep saying that. In fact, following the next election I

will be returned with a 5 per cent or 6 per cent majority without any trouble at all.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I hope that the Chair will not receive a dollar every time the member is out of order. There is a motion before the Chair; at the present time the honourable member is not speaking to it. I was going to pick up the member for Mawson at one time when she, also, strayed away from the motion.

Mr ASHENDEN: I look forward to being returned to this House after the next election (which I believe will be held in mid November) when I will be sitting on the Government benches helping a Liberal Government to implement housing interest policies that will truly benefit the people of this State. It appears that the member for Mawson is leaving the Chamber, because she does not want to hear any more of my argument. John Olsen has stated publicly that the South Australian Liberal Party firmly supports the regulation of interest rates as they now exist. I make it quite clear to the members for Mawson and Unley that my Party strongly supports the present system of regulation.

I believe that the member for Mawson made her speech on housing interest rates so that she could have something to send out to the people of her district. Like the rest of the Labor Party, the truth is the last thing that the member for Mawson is worried about. The member for Mawson will send out her speech, people will read it and they will assume that, because it is in *Hansard* and because it has been said, it must be true.

Mr Mayes interjecting:

Mr ASHENDEN: I do not mind the member for Unley interjecting: let him have his fun, because he has only a few more days left in this Chamber. We all know that the member for Unley has applied for his old position in the PSA. He sent in his application early enough so that he could go straight back to his old job following the election.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The Chair has already pointed out that the honourable member for Todd is not dealing, and so far, has not dealt, with the motion, which has nothing to do with whether or not the member for Todd is returned as a member of Parliament following the next election. I suggest that the member for Todd deals with the motion.

Mr ASHENDEN: Mr Deputy Speaker, I was responding to points made by the member for Mawson, who made a series of absolutely false allegations about my Party's approach to housing interest rates. The member for Mawson also dealt with the present Government's supposed record on housing. At the moment there are 9 000 more people waiting for Housing Trust homes than there were when her Party first came to power in 1982, yet she says that her Government has done a magnificent job! The Government also says that it has done a lot for employment. However, I say that it has done a lot for unemployment, because the number of unemployed in this State today is greater than it was when the Government came to power in 1982.

The interest rate level is one of the main reasons for the housing problem in South Australia today. I repeat: the member for Mawson did a lot of posturing and shed many crocodile tears during her contribution, and what she said was patent nonsense. She was trying to create fear in the minds of people about the Liberal Party's policy. Let us look at the problems that have really led to our present interest rate escalation. Housing interest rates today are higher in real terms than they have been for the past 50 years.

This debate was initiated by a member of a Party which in 1982 was absolutely unscrupulous and without any conscience whatsoever when it castigated the then Federal and State Liberal Governments for what they were supposed to have done in relation to increasing housing interest rates. The Labor Party did that in an attempt to win government, and it did it by using scare tactics. Never before has any Opposition stooped to the gutter tactics used by the Labor Opposition in 1982.

Mr Becker: It used blatant untruths.

Mr ASHENDEN: Yes. It used that tactic to win government. It is a Government based on untruths. The then Labor Opposition made certain allegations, of which we are all aware, about taxes. If members opposite are door knocking, as I am, they would know that people are absolutely fed to the teeth with the Government's posturing in relation to housing interest rates. In 1982, the then Labor Opposition used fear tactics in relation to interest rates to win government, and the member for Mawson is trying to use that tactic again. The then Leader of the Opposition (Hon. J.C. Bannon) promised to reduce interest rates, but, as I have said, interest rates today are the highest in real terms that they have been for the past 50 years. He also promised to reduce unemployment, but, again, there are more unemployed people today than when the Government came to office in 1982. He also promised not to increase or introduce any new taxes. We know what has happened in that respect. I could go on and on.

Let us have a look at the reason for the increase in interest rates. It is interesting to note that the member for Mawson is now trying to blame the Opposition for interest rates. When she was in Opposition, she blamed the Government. Now that she is in Government, it is the Opposition's fault. I would really like to know how an Opposition, which has not been able to influence interest rates, Government spending or various other things can possibly be blamed for the problems that her Party in both the South Australian Parliament and the Federal Parliament have brought upon us.

I point out to the member for Mawson that she cannot have it both ways. In 1982 it was the Government's fault. In 1985 it is the Opposition's fault. What utter and arrant nonsense. If the member for Mawson had been honest, she would have discussed the effect of Labor Government decisions and interference on interest rates today. I also point out that the honourable member is not in the House so she obviously does not want to hear the points that are being made. However, hopefully she will read—

Mr TRAINER: I rise on a point of order. I understand that under Standing Orders, it is not permissible to refer to people who are in the gallery. The member for Mawson is in the gallery within the four walls of this Chamber at the moment and accordingly should not be referred to.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I do not uphold the point of order. However, I point out to the honourable member for Todd that he ought to come back to the debate and not be so personal.

Mr ASHENDEN: As I said, this motion was moved by a member who is not in the House at the moment. That is of concern to me, because obviously she has no interest in the matter and her motion is for purely political purposes. Let us make quite clear the effect of the decisions and interference of the Federal and State Labor Governments on interest rates today. First, the Federal Government has instructed the Reserve Bank to withhold money here in Australia. They have decided to deliberately limit the amount of money which is available. If there is not very much money around, that which is there will be sought even more keenly. Therefore, when money is being sought more keenly, more interest has to be paid.

For the benefit of members opposite, let me put it simply. If you have $1 million available and 10 people are chasing it, there is competition, and they will offer a certain rate of interest to try and get the money. If only $500 000 is available and the same number of people chasing it, obviously they have to offer a greater incentive to somebody to lend

that money; otherwise it will be lent to someone else. Therefore, because of the Federal Government's deliberate decision to withhold money in Australia, there is not enough money available for borrowing. What is available is being keenly sought, so high interest rates are being demanded.

So, fact number one: interest rates today are high because of that deliberate policy of the Federal Labor Government. Fact number two: the Federal Government, through its ineptitude, has thrown the Australian dollar into chaos. When the Federal Government came to power, there was roughly $A1 to $US1. It is now 70 cents. Why? Because the Federal Labor Government made a deliberate decision which has resulted in the downturn in the value of the Australian dollar, and that downturn is a major factor which has led to increased interest rates.

Mr Mayes: This is rubbish.

Mr ASHENDEN: The member for Unley says, 'This is rubbish,' which shows that his whole upbringing has been in the union movement. He has no idea about small business or about pressure on money or funds. The honourable member, who is only showing an abysmal ignorance of monetary matters, should sit there and listen to the relevant arguments. Let us look at fact number three: the Federal and State Labor Governments have entered into a borrowing program of absolutely unprecedented level. Both Governments are borrowing money to an extent that has never been known before. This means, of course, that two massive organisations, a State Labor Government and a Federal Labor Government, are both chasing enormous amounts of limited money in the market place. In turn, this means that less money is available for other borrowers. So, because of the inordinately high level of borrowing by the State and Federal Governments, interest rates are being forced sky high.

Let me put on record that at the moment the State debt is $5 486 million, which is an increase of 38 per cent under this present Government. What an absolute disgrace! There we see it. With those borrowings, is it any wonder that money is hard to get? Is it any wonder that interest rates are sky high? Is it any wonder that the small person who wants to borrow money to buy a home is placed in the position that he is today, facing the highest level of interest rates in real terms for the last 50 years?

Let us also note that, because of this Government's overspending at the moment, repayments of interest alone on its borrowings are $375 million, which is three times the budget available to the Police Department. Government members cry their crocodile tears saying it is the Federal Liberal Opposition's fault that we have these problems. They do not even understand government. They do not have a clue. It is obvious that not one member opposite has ever had any experience in business management, whether in any form of private enterprise, large or small: otherwise, these statements would not be made.

Mr Oswald interjecting:

Mr ASHENDEN: Exactly. I repeat that the combined might of Federal and State Labor Governments in chasing money has squeezed the money supply, and interest rates are up. As I said, it is the small home owner and small home buyer that is forced to suffer.

The member for Mawson has returned to the Chamber. I will point out to her now that she is back that I have already stated that our Party's policy is not to support deregulation. Let us have a look at the next factor which is forcing interest rates sky high—State statutory authorities. The level of borrowing of State statutory authorities is up by more than 50 per cent in this Budget alone. This is done by Government direction. In other words, because the Premier and Treasurer has gone out to his State authorities and said, 'You must borrow this money,' we have not only the Federal and State Governments but also State statutory authorities chasing money at unprecedented levels. I see that members opposite are laughing their heads off. They think it is quite amusing that the small people out there are being forced from their homes because of the policies of the State and Federal Governments. We have the State statutory authorities increasing their borrowing tremendously, again placing greater demands on a money supply that is limited by the Federal Government, as a result of which interest rates are increasing.

Let us look at deregulation, which members opposite are so keen about. I thought that they may have listened yesterday to the points made by my Leader. The State Government's own bank, the State Bank, has deregulated interest rates. The member for Mawson is carrying on about deregulation when her own Government State Bank has deregulated interest rates deliberately. The majority of loans going out to State Bank borrowers are deregulated. Interest rates of up to 16 per cent are being charged by the State Bank on home loans.

The member for Mawson has gone very quiet. I would challenge her to deny this: the State Bank is charging up to 16 per cent on new home loans. The regulated level is considerably less than that, as the member knows. But, the State Bank, in a shifty way, has put housing loan borrowers into a situation where the loans that they have taken out are not subject to regulation. More than half the loans presently going out from the State Bank are under this deregulation. Here we have the member for Mawson moving a motion against deregulation, yet she does not even mention that her own Government's bank has deregulated in South Australia.

I make the point that, because of this higher interest that the State Bank is charging, the Government is of course reaping in extra taxation dollars. An amount of $18 million of extra taxation is coming to the State Government because of the deregulation of interest rates by the State Bank. In other words, Mr Bannon, our Premier, who says he bleeds for the poor people, is using his bank to bring in extra taxation.

Ms Lenehan: You're desperate.

Mr ASHENDEN: The member for Mawson says that I am desperate. I would like to hear her answer the points that I am making. Let us have a look at what we have at the moment with the Federal and State Labor Governments. There is high spending and unprecedented levels of borrowing. There is high taxation, and in relation to the State Bank $18 million of tax is involved. Members opposite are having difficulty understanding this matter, so let me explain it to them simply. Because the interest rates of the State Bank have been deregulated by the present Government, we now have a situation where the State Government will reap an extra $18 million from people borrowing money for the purchase of homes, while giving back $3 million, or whatever the amount is, to a selected group of people—a matter to which I will refer again later.

Housing interest rates have been deregulated by the State Government's own bank. People must now make huge interest payments on loans. This applies not only to people taking out new loans but also to people with existing loans. Repayments to the bank have increased by some $70 or $80 a month. One of my constituents has informed me that his repayments have increased by over $100 a month in the past few months, although this person was led to believe when arranging the loan that the borrowing would be at a controlled rate of interest. Subsequently this person found out that this was not the case, and his family is in dire straits.

One can imagine how angry they were to find that the Government, in trying to save its own political neck, had

given support to a small group of people who happened to have taken money away from the cooperative societies. People contributing to the State Bank will be providing an extra $18 million in tax collections, which tax can be used to subsidise other home buyers. Is it any wonder that people in the community are angry? Members opposite who have done some doorknocking recently would surely have got the message that I have received when I have been doorknocking.

Mr Baker: If members opposite stayed by their telephones in their electorate offices a little longer than usual, they would find out what people are saying.

Mr ASHENDEN: I thank the honourable member for adding that comment. I have had an unprecedented number of telephone calls and letters (as well as feedback on doorknocking) indicating that people are angry about the level of interest rates and with the action that the Government took last week in deciding to assist just a few people. A point made frequently by people is 'Why should my tax subsidise someone else buying a home?'

Members interjecting:

Mr ASHENDEN: I notice that the member for Unley thinks this is amusing, but my constituents certainly do not think so. Constituents have invited me into their homes; they have outlined their financial position and have shown me their pay packets, lists of itemised costs, and so on, including details of interest repayments. They are angry, and I do not blame them. They were misled by the Labor Party when in Opposition. The Labor Party promised that under a Labor Government interest rates would fall. Even this year the Premier promised that interest rates would fall. He promised the world, but people in the community have seen this Government for what it is worth. They are aware of the broken promises in relation to interest rates. This will constitute only one of the many nails in the Government's coffin at the next election.

At the moment interest rates are higher, in real terms, than they have been for 50 years. People have been conned—that is the only word that I can use. I would be staggered if people with loans from the State Bank have not contacted members opposite. Many people have told me that they were led to believe that the money borrowed from the State Bank was in the form of a housing loan, although they have now been told that it is not a housing loan but a market rate mortgage. This is merely a system of deregulation. The State Bank has deregulated interest rates using backdoor tactics. The interest rate level is now higher than it has been for 50 years.

In relation to the motion before the House, the member for Mawson has put forward one of the most spurious arguments that I have ever heard, with a lot of posturing and crocodile tears. Let me go over the real problems, for the benefit of members opposite. First, we have the highest interest rates in 50 years. This has occurred, first, because the Federal Labor Government has reduced the amount of money to be made available. Secondly, the value of the Australian dollar is at a very low level which has caused interest rates to rise.

Further, the level of Federal and State Labor Government borrowings are at an unprecedented high level. State Labor Government borrowings are up 38 per cent. When a Government takes in money like that and the money supply is limited, obviously very little money is left for the public to borrow, and when people do borrow they must pay exorbitant interest rates—as charged by the State Bank, at 16 per cent, the highest of any lending institution, and from which the State Government stands to reap an extra $18 million of tax.

How can the member for Mawson move such a motion when it is the present Government's action which is increasing interest rates to 16 per cent and which is obtaining an extra $18 million from taxes due to increased interest rates? Notwithstanding, the member for Mawson said that she was concerned about home buyers. I point out to the honourable member that the present Government's large borrowing program is forcing up interest rates. How can one hope to compete against the combined might of the Federal and State Labor Governments in relation to borrowing money? To top it all off, the State Government has instructed statutory authorities to borrow extra money, and this year they will borrow over 50 per cent more. Again, this is taking away money that should be available for home buyers.

The honourable member's motion refers to the House expressing 'its strong opposition to the Liberal Party's proposals for the deregulation of housing interest rates'. I again point out to the honourable member that the Liberal Party has absolutely nothing to do with the present interest rates. Federally, a Labor Government is in power, and the State Labor Government here is very temporarily in power. These Governments have forced interest rates to their present level. As far as deregulation is concerned, I point out again for the benefit of members opposite that the State Government's own bank has deregulated interest rates: the State Bank is charging up to 16 per cent on home loans at the moment—which is considerably higher than any other lending institution.

The member for Mawson knows, from 1982, how a fear campaign can be whipped up. She will write to constituents and say, 'Look at what I am trying to do.' However, she is being totally dishonest and is crying crocodile tears, obvious to all, and it will not work. Another most obvious example is that of the Government's recent announcement in relation to so-called tax cuts. Members of the public reacted very cynically to that announcement, because they know that it was only a vote buying exercise. In relation to all the money that is being thrown out to the north-east and the areas in the south, again, the feed-back from my constituents has been consistent, with people saying, 'Whom do they think they are kidding?'

I will use the colloquial term put to me just today by one of my constituents: 'For three years they've screwed us. Do they really think they're going to make us believe the promises they're making now?' The answer is, 'Of course not.' The motion moved by the member for Mawson is hollow: it has been moved for political expediency. It is posturing of the worst kind, and the crocodile tears have to be seen to be believed. The blame for our high interest rates on home loans today rests fairly and squarely with both the Federal and State Labor Governments.

Mr TRAINER secured the adjournment of the debate.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION: MEMBER'S REMARKS

Ms LENEHAN (Mawson): I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Before the member for Mawson makes a personal explanation, the Chair feels that it should properly be pointed out to her that unless it is, in fact, a personal explanation, the honourable member could jeopardise her right of reply in the debate.

Ms LENEHAN: Thank you, Mr Deputy Speaker; yes, I am aware of that. I wish to place on record the fact that I have been misrepresented. The member for Todd on at least six or seven occasions—although I was not counting—alluded to the fact that I was not in the Chamber. I was in the Speaker's Gallery and within the legal precincts of this Parliament at all times. I was only a few feet away from the honourable member, and he could see that I was here.

AUSTRALIA DAY HOLIDAY

Adjourned debate on motion of Mr Baker:

That this House believes that, in keeping with the spirit of the founding of this country, the Australia Day holiday should be held on 26 January each year and urges the Federal Government to implement this policy

(Continued from 18 September. Page 1015.)

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD (Deputy Premier): It is perhaps unfortunate that the member for Mitcham, in introducing this motion, did not take the opportunity to speak to the employing community about the proposition. It is the Government's understanding that employers are very much against the proposition placed before the House. The opposition of the employing community to any proposition is not of itself, of course, sufficient reason for arguing that something should not happen. However, it is of course an important factor which has to be weighed alongside any other factors brought to bear on the question.

It may be useful to the House if I were to give some brief background to this matter. The official observance of Australia Day is held on 26 January each year. Where Australia Day falls on any day other than a Monday its associated public holiday is proclaimed in each Australian State and Territory, except the Northern Territory, on the following Monday. Where 26 January falls on a Monday, the public holiday is aligned with the official observance of the anniversary.

In the past, organisations such as the Australian Natives Association and the Order of Australia Association, along with private individuals, have argued that the Australia Day official observation and its associated holiday should be held on 26 January, irrespective of the day of the week that coincides with that date. The day's historical significance is given as the basis for that.

The Prime Minister, in a letter dated 17 August 1983 to State Premiers and the Chief Minister of the Northern Territory, has also argued for the holiday celebration of Australia Day to be held on its actual anniversary date, particularly in the 1988 bicentennial year. Seeking to resolve any problems associated with the proposal in good time, the Prime Minister very responsibly invited comment, and that matter has proceeded.

In January this year, the Director of the Government and Advisory Services Division, Department of the Premier and Cabinet, requested that an item relating to the 1988 Australia Day holiday be placed on the Industrial Relations Advisory Council agenda for future consideration. Although there was still some two years and eight months before 26 January 1988, the fact that in that year it will fall on a Tuesday, combined with calls for Australia Day to be officially observed and celebrated on the actual anniversary date, had the potential to create a not insignificant industrial relations problem, particularly as early indications were that both the trade union movement and private industry, at least in South Australia, would resist the proposal.

The Industrial Relations Advisory Council agreed unanimously on 22 May this year that the 1988 bicentennial Australia Day holiday should be celebrated on Monday 1 February 1988. The South Australian Government has indicated that, because 1988 is the bicentennial year for Australia, consideration will be given to proclaiming the Australia Day holiday on Tuesday, 26 January, subject to agreement by all other States and Territories, and for 1988 only.

That is the present position in relation to this matter. Perhaps that is where it should reside, at least for the time being. But, I should make clear to members the South Australian employer position. We have heard very recently in this place in relation to another debate all sorts of wild accusations about the Government benches, about our being unsympathetic to the position of people in industry, and all those sorts of things.

So, it is important that I place on record that this Government listens very carefully to employer organisations, not only through the official channel for communication between Government, trade unions and employers (the IRAC organisation to which I have also referred), but indeed as a result of regular meetings between the Premier and other Ministers with industry leaders and, of course, deputations that occur from time to time on specific matters that come on to the agenda of Government.

So, let not members of this House or the South Australian community generally run away with the idea that this Government will not listen to a position put forward by employer organisations. I reiterate that it appears that the member for Mitcham in introducing this matter has not taken the trouble to consult with employer organisations as to the rights and wrongs of the matter.

The South Australian Chamber of Commerce and Industry, the Retail Traders Association and the South Australian Employers Federation have all expressed opposition to the proposal to align the holiday with the actual anniversary date in 1988 or in any other year. Their concern in those matters is, of course, that where the holiday would fall on the Tuesday, there is every chance that there would be a very high rate of absenteeism from indusutry on the Monday as well. This would occur in two ways: either as a result of pressure to have that Monday declared a holiday or as a result of the maximum utilisation of rostered days off. So, even without the declaration of a special holiday on 25 January, there is a common belief among all employer groups contacted that workers would arrange to have the day off anyway, which is of concern to employing organisations.

The situation really comes down to this: the South Australian Government has agreed that the historical significance of both Australia Day and the bicentennial year should be recognised by the Tuesday, the actual day of 26 January in that year, being declared the Australia Day holiday, on the understanding that all States will move in concert on that matter. At this stage it would be dangerous and ill conceived to move to a general situation in which the Australia Day holiday was always held on the 26th. The reasons for that are understood. They are the reasons that were put forward by the Prime Minister in the approach that he made to the States and Territories a year or so ago, in the circumstances to which I have alluded.

The matter has not yet been fully discussed, and I believe it would not be well received, either in industry or amongst the trade unions, if we were to move to it at this stage. With the caveat that the South Australian Government has agreed to this proposition in relation to the 1988 year, assuming that all other States move in concert with us I urge the House to reject this motion.

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

FUEL FREIGHT EQUALISATION SCHEME

Adjourned debate on motion of Mr Blacker:

That this House condemns the Federal Government for its decision to terminate the fuel freight equalisation Scheme thereby treating non-metropolitan people as second class citizens and in particular it draws to the attention of the Federal Treasurer and Prime Minister the effects such actions will have in:

(a) increasing freight costs on all consumer goods thereby further increasing the cost of living for non-metropolitan people;

(b) increasing fuel costs in primary production thereby:
(i) forcing smaller operators out of the industry;
(ii) encouraging greater use of chemical farming as an alternative to traditional farming practices;
(iii) forcing an already cost squeezed industry to the point of bankruptcy;
(iv) raising the overall costs of production; and
(v) raising the freight costs of primary products which will increase home consumption prices in particular of wheat, barley and livestock;
(c) increasing the already high costs of the fishing industry which will, in cases where the respective fishery is managed with quotas, force many of those operators out of business; and
(d) the tourist industry generally and in particular, the hotel and motel, hospitality, caravan and tent manufacturing, airline, coach and busline, and vehicle and associated component parts industries;

and further, this House calls on the Federal Government to immediately reinstate the scheme.

(Continued from 18 September. Page 1019.)

Mr MEIER (Goyder): I will continue briefly with my remarks on this matter. As members who were present on the last occasion that this matter was debated would appreciate, we are talking about the hardships faced by the rural community, in particular relating to the unsatisfactory situation that has occurred due to the Federal Government's interference concerning the fuel levy system. On the previous occasion I pointed out that it would not only affect vehicles used by farmers and rural producers because of the fuel costs, but it would affect rural producers through their fertiliser costs and export costs, because fuel is involved across the board. This is a matter that is having a detrimental effect on South Australia's rural industry and, undoubtedly, on the rural industry throughout this country. I believe that this is occurring at a time when we are trying to get our rural economy back on its feet.

We have seen examples of the farmers marching in Adelaide, in other capital cities and in Canberra. They have told us that they are finding the going very tough. I hope that this Government will do everything in its power in order to put pressure on the Federal Government so that some sense of reality can prevail in relation to fuel costs. At this time many parts of South Australia are not looking as promising as they would have hoped some time ago. Whilst large areas of my own electorate are showing positive signs, I believe that some areas further north are in dire straits.

It is therefore detrimental to this State that the Federal Government should interfere by removing the fuel equalisation scheme at a time when it was most inopportune to do so. Since the last occasion I debated this matter, we have seen petrol prices in the city areas falling significantly and yet the country prices are a good 10c per litre higher. Last week the Attorney-General issued a statement indicating reasons why he felt that the Government could not interfere, but I think that the Government, even in this State, has to look at that problem.

We are talking about the massive differentiation between the fuel costs in the city as compared to those in the country. Unless this matter is readdressed by the Federal Government, it will find that the economy will go further and further downhill. Surely it must have recognised, when it came to office, that one of the biggest boosts was the rural sector and, at a time when the rural sector needs help, let us hope that, for the sake of the State and the nation, the Federal Government will recognise that we need a scheme, if not the same as the one that has just been withdrawn, at least something similar so that the rural sector once again can receive fuel at a similar price to that paid in the metropolitan area.

The Hon. R.G. PAYNE secured the adjournment of the debate.

TOXIC WASTE DISPOSAL

Adjourned debate on motion of Hon. P.B. Arnold:

That this House rejects the proposal construction of a toxic waste disposal incinerator within the Murray-Darling Rivers catchment area or any other populated area and calls on the Government to vigorously oppose the project.

(Continued from 18 September. Page 1019.)

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD (Deputy Premier): The motion that we have before us was moved by the member for Chaffey. I have a great deal of sympathy with that motion, except on this point, and that is the reference to the words 'any other populated area'. I think that the honourable member really is taking that matter too far. For example, if the New South Wales Government put together a proposition (and I am on safe ground here, because this is one that has been rejected, but I think by way of illustration it is not unreasonable) for such a facility at Botany, I am not too sure why we, as a State Parliament, should have any particular interest in that matter.

The Hon. P.B. Arnold: I was trying to cover the Broken Hill situation.

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: That is understood, and it may be possible later in the debate, as a result of some consultation, for perhaps some slight rewording to be undertaken. The Western Australian Government has expressed some interest in the construction of such a facility in the Kalgoorlie-Coolgardie area and, if that is to fail, in my view on a policy matter, it would not be because of its proximity to an area of population, but rather because the bulk of the hazardous materials that would be thus disposed of would have to be transported over very long distances, either by water or by land.

Transmission by water could possibly be hazardous, although we are aware of the Volcanus, which is an ocean-based disposal facility. However, if land transmission were involved, the breadth of the Murray-Darling Basin would be involved in the transport of the bulk of these hazardous materials, because most of them are produced in the Sydney and Melbourne industrial areas.

So, I do not think that the honourable member and I are far apart on this. I should like the opportunity to expand a little on this matter because I have visited such a facility in France and have available some information which I could perhaps share with honourable members. However, in view of the need for other matters on the Notice Paper to be considered, and if the honourable member has no strong objection to this procedure, I seek leave to continue my remarks later.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

HILLS FACE ZONE FIRE PROTECTION

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

That, in the opinion of this House, the Government should take immediate action to—

(a) have the large amounts of highly flammable dead vegetation, olive trees and noxious weeds removed from the Government owned section of the hills face zone;
(b) assist and encourage more hills local community fire action committees to be set up; and
(c) provide adequate fire tracks in the hills face zone.

(Continued from 18 September. Page 1022.)

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD (Deputy Premier): This matter raises interesting questions which in part have also been

canvassed in relation to a Bill that has been placed on the Notice Paper by the colleague of the member for Fisher, the member for Eyre. Obviously, we are all concerned at the devastation caused by two major fires within three years, and we should certainly compliment the member for Fisher on having drawn this matter to our attention in this way. However, there are matters of detail that I should like to consider before indicating a definite approach to the motion. So, with that in mind, I seek leave to continue my remarks later.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

TRANSPORT SYSTEM

Adjourned debate on the motion of Hon. D.C. Brown:

That this House deplores the transport policies and performances of the Government and in particular its failure to plan for the long term transport needs of Adelaide residents and its waste of public funds and condemns both the present and previous Ministers of Transport for their lack of ministerial control during the past 2½ years.

(Continued from 18 September. Page 1026.)

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY (Minister of Transport): I oppose this motion, which was moved by the member for Davenport, for a number of reasons—23, in fact. They are the 23 reasons that the member for Davenport has used to seek to condemn the performance of the Government including both the previous Minister and me. He pointed out during his contribution that in no way was it a personal attack on my predecessor in this portfolio or on myself, but the terminology, the spleen, the spite and the vindictiveness came through strongly in that speech. So, one would need to take with a pinch of salt the statements by which the honourable member sought to temper the points of view that he expressed.

Before going into the points that I want to address today, as time is somewhat limited for me to complete my remarks today, I want to refer to a situation that occurred earlier today, when there was some uproar, discussion and dissension within this House on a certain matter. I was at a disadvantage because I thought that I was speaking to intelligent people on an intelligent subject. I was not able to appreciate that honourable members opposite did not know the difference between a corridor and an alignment. So that the member for Davenport, his colleague the member for Glenelg, and others understand what this earlier debate today was about (and it bears upon the current debate), I will explain it to honourable members.

A corridor has been determined for a road, railway or whatever down south for some 19 or 20 years. Members opposite do not know the difference between a corridor, a road or an alignment. Within that corridor, which at one place is between 800 and 900 metres wide, the potential exists for any number of separate alignments. Members opposite have been trying to suggest that a corridor is an alignment and that, if we have only one corridor, the road alignment will take up the whole corridor. That will be a wide road—between 800 and 900 metres wide.

So that honourable members know exactly what the debate was about today, I point out that within that corridor a number of alignments are under study currently. When the preferred alignments are available and the factual material has been gathered together, they will be presented to the Government, enabling the Highways Department to present such a recommendation to the Minister: that will be some time in June next year. I apologise, as I believed that members opposite realised that the corridor was not the alignment. When we talk about a corridor, we can talk about a variety of alignments. I wanted to make that clear.

I ask members who have not taken the opportunity as yet, or who are not normally masochistic enough to read what the member for Davenport says, to spend some time reading through this vote of condemnation of the Government's performance on transport matters. If it is not the most arrogant, simplistic, ill-informed and poorly constructed motion that has ever been presented to this House, I am a very poor judge indeed. I have been here for a long time—considerably longer than the honourable member who moved the motion.

I want to take these 23 points in different groups as some need to be responded to in some depth. Others have been dealt with on a number of occasions in various debates in this House and in a number of others the honourable member is obviously very cross that the Government has solved problems that his Party was not able to solve and he finds himself on the opposite end of the argument, anyway.

Due to lack of time, I will refer to the ninth point. The honourable member criticised the Government and me as Minister for dispensing with the green plate and white plate system and bringing in a single plate system for our taxis. I happened to be with the honourable member on the steps when he made his speech to the taxi industry representatives and to a handful of tow truck operators or representatives. I can very clearly recall the honourable member saying that this action of the Government would bring dire economic consequences upon the taxi industry in South Australia.

He promised them as the defender of small business and private enterprise in South Australia that when in government he would ensure that the taxi industry got all the protection that it deserved. The honourable member was very strong in saying that he would defend their rights and future security. Well, as I recall, and as other commentators predicted, including the people within the industry themselves, on the day that the two plate system was to end, confusion was to have reigned in the streets of metropolitan Adelaide. Let me take that second point first.

The changeover from the pre-existing system to the current system was very smooth indeed. In fact, if honourable members took the time to have a look at the taxi industry and the people who sat on what were regarded as the prime stands in the city, they would see the same people working from those stands and those who were operating from the radio still operating in that manner. In fact, there has been very little change indeed in the operation methods of those who are working in the industry.

The critical factor that this Parliament and the people of South Australia ought to be very well aware of occurred this morning before the Subordinate Legislation Committee and was even more clearly indicated by some advertisements in this morning's *Advertiser*. I recall that the honourable member for Davenport said that by introducing the single plate system I, as Minister, had in one fell swoop dealt almost a death blow to the taxi industry in South Australia. Well, when the change was made, the market price for a green plate taxi licence was $43 000. The market price for a white plate licence was about $44 000, or about a $1 000 differential between the two.

I was told by people on the steps that I had put their future security and superannuation in doubt because it was the value of the plate that was their superannuation, etc. Today, the Subordinate Legislation Committee was advised, I am led to believe, by the Chairman of the Taxi-Cab Board in South Australia that in the month that has elapsed since that decision was made two plates that are being processed at the moment and waiting for the approval of the Taxi-Cab Board for the transfer were sold at $53 400 and $54 000 respectively. There has been an increase in the unit price of a taxi plate in South Australia of $10 000 to $11 000 in one month—25 per cent capital appreciation—as a result

of that single decision made by the Government to take out of the taxi industry the single most divisive element that existed, namely, the differing rules that applied to differing plates.

In today's *Advertiser*, I understand (although I have not checked this out because this debate came on just a little too quickly) from what I have been told that there are a number of plates advertised for sale at $65 000. Yet the honourable member for Davenport on the front steps told me and anybody who would wish to listen, 'Come into this House', and in this debate he talked about this unilateral decision that would wreak disaster on the industry.

But what has happened? Within one month, those people who on the front steps were telling me what a disastrous blow this was to their viability, that the white or green plate licences that they held would be devalued by the decision that I have made, are now seeking to sell their plates at a capital appreciation of 50 per cent in one month. That seems to me to be the sort of business of which a lot of other people in South Australia would like to take advantage.

In no way am I critical of the taxi industry because I believe that by and large they have got their act together. I believe also that as a result of the next three or four months, when they are able to get together as a united body so that I am then able to introduce the balance of the recommendations that I have received, we will have an extremely strong, viable and efficient taxi industry in South Australia.

I am happy to say that one single decision that I took leads me to be confident that that will happen. I know that a lot of people within the industry today are prepared to acknowledge that their fears were groundless. I am also prepared to acknowledge that when the decision was made some members of the taxi industry—and I point particularly to the white plate independents—had good reason to be concerned about the decision that was made. I hope that the fears of those members of the industry have been put to rest.

In the same speech, the honourable member took some time to criticise a decision that this Government, and I again as Minister, had taken in relation to the tow truck industry. In the same speech, the honourable member took some time to criticise a decision that this Government, and I again as Minister, had taken in relation to the tow truck industry. The honourable member made great play about the regulations. He said that they were ineffective, that they had caused dissatisfaction in the industry, that by and large people in the industry did not support them, and that they ought to be changed. I have challenged the honourable member before, and I do so again today, to talk to the Automobile Chamber of Commerce which represents 90 per cent (I think somewhat more) of the tow truck industry in South Australia. There is no doubt that if he did he would find that the tow truck industry in South Australia is happy with the regulations and with the way in which they are being enforced.

Even so, the Government and I believe that the regulations must be reviewed. The regulations were essential at the time they were introduced, because the industry was divided. The industry was in confusion—that is probably the kindest way to describe it. However, the troubles that were apparent then are not so apparent now, and some of the more stringent regulations could well be looked at. Having said that, I must say that the Automobile Chamber of Commerce, which represents the industry, has made strong representations to me verbally not to change those regulations which they believe are working admirably. I think that the House ought to note the background of criticisms made by the honourable member.

First, the amendment to the accident towing roster scheme was framed by the Tonkin Government in 1981. The member for Davenport was a prominent member of that Government and yet he is now full of criticism for the accident towing roster system. However, that was introduced by a Government of which the member for Davenport was a leading member in this House and in Cabinet. The regulations which more particularly have raised the wrath of the honourable member came into effect from October 1984 but they were commenced during the time of the Tonkin Government, although implemented by the present Government.

Of course, the regulations are necessary for the administration of the Act, and in their final form were subject to lengthy negotiations with the Tow Truck Division of the South Australian Automobile Chamber of Commerce. The first time those regulations were brought before this House they were disallowed. The honourable member was well aware of that, and he had the opportunity to express in this place his disagreement to those regulations. However, I think a check of the record would show that the honourable member did not take that opportunity.

When the honourable member was speaking to a small group representing a very small sector of the tow truck industry, namely, the Tow Truck Owners and Operators Association, he said that he was not aware that the regulations—the legislation—had gone through Parliament—and that it must have been introduced through the back door. I was amazed and somewhat amused by that statement. I explained to the members of the Tow Truck Owners and Operators Association that whatever the member for Davenport is (and he is many things) he is not stupid, although he does his best to convince people that he is. However, he understands the system that applies in this place; he has been a Minister of the Crown, and of course he knows that legislation or regulations do not come in through the back door. The fact remains that a prominent member in the Parliament, vitally concerned about the well-being of the industry, was unaware that the legislation had been introduced—and that was the excuse that he gave to his friends in the industry about his lack of action on their behalf.

His criticism of me is dependent on the advice that he receives from a small group of people. I have met with that small group; I am not very concerned about the sarcastic description of that meeting by the honourable member when he was discussing this issue. Suffice to say that I have given an undertaking to the people involved that their worries, complaints and queries will be looked at. However, they must be considered in relation to the overall need and the prevailing view of the industry as a whole. That will be done in relation to that group of people who visited the member for Davenport. I point out, though, that the honourable member did not want to speak to the majority representative sectors in the industry. The small group involved has a representative on the committee that will be undertaking the examination.

In terms of the one plate system and the tow truck issue, I totally reject the criticisms of the honourable member. In his motion, once again the honourable member referred to the STA deficit. During Question Time some two months ago I had the opportunity to point out to the honourable member that he did not understand the accounting of the STA, that he did not understand the difference between cash items and non-cash items. The honourable member thought that it was a bit presumptuous of me to suggest that he did not know that. I think I saw somewhere that the honourable member had studied business management: however, he, like myself, has been a public servant, working for the Department of Agriculture. We have worked for the public sector all our lives. I worked for the Australian

National railways, and I suggest that my exposure to business management and business ideals, as purchasing officer for the railways, dealing with millions of dollars worth of business weekly, gave me as good an insight into management procedures as the member for Davenport gained while working for the Department of Agriculture. The honourable member raised this matter again during the Estimates Committees.

The Hon. D.C. Brown interjecting:

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: Qualifications are one thing, and practical experience is another. The ability to understand figures is something altogether difficult. During the Estimates Committee proceedings, the honourable member once again raised this matter concerning the STA. You, Mr Deputy Speaker, would recall this, because you were chairing the Committee. I made an offer to the honourable member that he could discuss these issues with officers of the STA during the lunch break so that he could be fully acquainted with the system and the figures and so that he would not need to once again raise these red herrings. I recall that he did raise the matter again briefly when the Estimates Committee reconvened, but it did not last very long. Therefore, I will not refer again to the honourable member's allegations about what he considers to be the real deficit of the STA.

Item 6 of this 23 item motion refers to the O-Bahn project. Once again, the honourable member is using that popular rhetoric of his Party that the Government has delayed the construction of the O-Bahn and that had the Liberal Government remained in office the O-Bahn would have been completed by 1986. I have put that furphy to rest—not once, but twice. However, I am prepared to do so again.

When the Liberal Government first introduced the O-Bahn system it indicated that it intended to complete the project before the end of 1986—in fact by mid-1985. Therefore, the previous Government had to ensure an adequate cash flow so that the mid-1985 completion date could be met and the system could be operating by the end of 1986. That was all right until Treasury became involved in providing the necessary funds. The original proposal was all right also until the Budget Review Committee, of which the member for Davenport was a member, became involved.

Of course, the whole timetable then changed. In fact, the Budget Review Committee (comprising the member for Davenport, the Hon. Mr Griffin, and chaired by the member for Kavel—then Deputy Premier) stated quite clearly—and documentation is available to me as Minister—that, because of the stringencies of the 1982-83 and 1983-84 financial years which they knew any South Australian Government would be facing, because o the economic mismanagement that had occurred, the O-Bahn could not be completed before the end of 1986, and the completion date had to be extended beyond 1986. The member for Torrens, as Minister responsible at that time, had sought to put in place for 1982-83 funding of $29 500 000, which was needed to meet the completion date of mid-1985, or before the end of 1986. Treasury approved, on the recommendation of the Budget Review Committee, $12 500 000.

In one single stroke under the previous Government, funding on the O-Bahn was reduced by $17 million in one year—the only year that the Liberal Party was in control of Treasury and the only year that it could show its good faith towards the completion date which it is still trying to convince the people of South Australia it was working towards. The first year, when $29 500 000 was required to meet the completion date that the previous Government had pronounced, it funded $12 500 000. The Liberal Party did not have the opportunity after that to show what it would have done in the second or third year, but we know that when we came to office this State faced a deficit of $80 million. In fact, had strong and immediate action not been taken, by the end of 1983 the South Australian Government would not have been able to pay its wages bill—

An honourable member: You're joking.

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: —without going cap in hand to the Federal Government. The member for Hanson knows that very well. He is at least one person on the opposite side who understands finance and the position that this Government was in. For the member for Davenport to condemn this Government for not completing the O-Bahn before 1986 is quite outrageous, because members opposite never intended to meet that timetable.

In addition, the honourable member says that we have underspent on the O-Bahn. One of the main reasons for that is that we have been able to secure considerable economies. We are doing the work more cheaply than we anticipated, but the timetable remains constant. We will open on time that section of the O-Bahn to which we committed ourselves early in 1983, and we will meet the construction date for the whole of the O-Bahn which we extended until 1988. We will meet and have met our construction timetable. No criticism can be made of this Government in the way that the honourable member seeks.

I will wait until the honourable member returns to the House before addressing myself to the numberplate issue on which he wanted to condemn me. I would like him to be present then. He also said that the Government was negligent: bungle No. 11 relates to delays of more than two years in upgrading Reservoir Drive. Here his absolute effrontery and arrogance come to the fore. He said that he and the member for Boothby were responsible for work starting on Reservoir Drive.

What did his colleague the member for Fisher (a local member in the area) say about that? In his speech on the same subject he stated clearly that the member for Davenport had had no effect on the timing of construction work on Reservoir Drive—none at all—yet he likes to claim that he did. He would like to suggest that his representations were responsible for it. I am not aware of them. As there are other matters that need to be addressed within the few minutes available to the House, I will deal with the other 17 issues later. I seek leave to continue my remarks later.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

Mr OSWALD: I rise on a point of order, Mr Deputy Speaker. Did the Minister seek leave to continue his remarks? I thought the understanding was that he would conclude his remarks.

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: No, Sir. I wish to make a personal explanation.

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: I seek leave to continue my remarks.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The Chair will decide whether or not the Minister seeks leave to make a personal explanation. The question has been put. The Minister sought leave to continue his remarks; leave was granted, and the position now is that the adjourned debate be made an Order of the Day for 23 October. The honourable member for Morphett.

Mr OSWALD: For 23 October, Sir.

[*Sitting suspended from 5.57 to 7.30 p.m.*]

PEST PLANTS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD (Minister of Education): I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

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

Leave granted.

Explanation of Bill

The principal object of this Bill is to give pest plant control boards a clear power to enter into contracts with landowners for the control of pest plants on their lands. A recent judgment in the District Court of Adelaide ruled that such a power was not contemplated by the principal Act, and that therefore any such contract was invalid. This decision has the potential to impede quite seriously the proper control of pest plants in this State as, in many cases, it is only the pest plant control boards that can carry out the necessary work. In the remoter areas of the State in particular, landowners do not have access to private contractors, and if an owner does not himself have the resources or equipment for effective pest plant control on his land, then the nearest pest plant control board is the only alternative.

Private contracting work has also had the desirable effect of generating funds to enable control boards to meet their obligations under loans taken out for the purpose of setting up the boards with all the plant and equipment necessary for the enforcement of the Act.

Clauses 1 and 2 are formal. The commencement of the amendment is back-dated to the commencement of the principal Act, so that any contracts previously entered into by control boards are validated. Clause 3 inserts a new provision empowering a control board to enter into contracts with landowners or other control boards for the destruction or control of pest plants. It is provided that such contracts may relate to land outside the control area of the board. Clause 4 re-casts the immunity from liability provision. The present provision gives immunity to not only various individuals such as control boards and commission members and staff, but also to the boards themselves and to the commission. This is undesirable, as such provisions are only intended to give immunity from personal liability. The new provision is therefore limited to protecting staff, board and commission members, authorised officers and other persons acting at the direction of the commission or a control board. The section also contains the now standard provision requiring the Crown to pick up any liability from which such a person is protected.

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

EVIDENCE ACT AMENDMENT BILL (No. 2)

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

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

That this Bill be now read a second time.

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

Leave granted.

Explanation of Bill

The right of an accused to make an unsworn statement was abolished in 1975 in Queensland, in 1976 in Western Australia and in 1984 in the Northern Territory. The question of the abolition of the right of an accused to make an unsworn statement has been continuing in South Australia since 1975 when the Criminal Law and Penal Methods Reform Committee of South Australia (the Mitchell Committee) in its Third Report, Court Procedure and Evidence, argued for abolition of the right. The committee put its argument in these terms:

> There is no method of testing its veracity except by opposing it to the evidence of witnesses who have been called to give evidence and have been cross-examined. The accused is in danger of conviction and of suffering a penalty and the witnesses are not. Nevertheless it must be a most unedifying spectacle for a jury to see and listen to a young girl, the prosecutrix in a charge of rape, being stringently cross-examined and subsequently to hear the accused merely read a statement giving his version of what happened without being exposed to any questioning at all. (Chapter 7, para. 7.3.3)

In 1981 the Select Committee of the Legislative Council on Unsworn Statement and Related Matters recommended the retention of the right of the accused to make an unsworn statement but that the unsworn statement should be made subject to the general rules which apply to sworn evidence. The committee's recommendations were implemented in 1983.

I do not intend to repeat the arguments in favour of abolition and retention of the right to make an unsworn statement. These arguments should be well known to members by now. The reasoning of the Mitchell Committee in arguing for abolition is convincing. However, the committee's recommendation that the right to make an unsworn statement should be abolished completely does not take into account those in the community who would be at a distinct disadvantage if the only way they could present their case was by way of sworn evidence, which would then, of course, open the way for cross-examination. I have in mind not only tribal Aborigines but also people who suffer from such mental or physical handicaps which would prevent cross-examination of them being helpful in arriving at the truth.

The provisions of this Bill abolish the right of the accused to make an unsworn statement, thus ending the 'unedifying spectacle' referred to by the Mitchell Committee. The Bill as introduced in another place protected those who simply could not be expected to undergo cross-examination. This was achieved by giving the judge a discretion to allow the defendant to make an unsworn statement if he would not, by reason of intellectual or physical handicap or cultural background, be a satisfactory witness. That provision was removed in the other place and this Bill now completely abolishes the unsworn statement.

Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 provides that the measure is to come into operation on a day to be fixed by proclamation. Clause 3 provides for the repeal of section 18a of the principal Act and the substitution of a new provision abolishing the right of any person charged with an offence to make an unsworn statement at the trial in defence of charge.

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

SUPERANNUATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

POLICE PENSIONS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

RURAL INDUSTRY ASSISTANCE (RATIFICATION OF AGREEMENT) BILL

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD (Minister of Education): I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

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

Leave granted.

Explanation of Bill

In introducing this Bill to Parliament the Government is again demonstrating its commitment to agriculture in South Australia. The Bill ratifies the Commonwealth States Rural Adjustment Agreement 1985 which is authorised under the auspices of the States and Northern Territory Grants (Rural Adjustment) Act 1985 of the Commonwealth.

The new agreement and Commonwealth legislation followed a review of the previous Rural Adjustment Scheme and an inquiry by the Industries Assistance Commission. The agreement will allow assistance to be provided to primary producers along the lines of previous Rural Adjustment Schemes. Assistance falls into three broad categories.

Part A assistance provides for concessional loans or interest rate subsidies to be provided to primary producers, including apiculturalists and acquaculturalists, to assist with Farm Build Up Farm Improvement Debt Reconstruction. To be eligible for this type of assistance primary producers must be unable to obtain adequate commercial credit on affordable terms and must have good prospects for long-term viability after being assisted. Interest rates on loans will be regularly reviewed and increased to commercial rates once a farm business has achieved an acceptable level of profits. Interest rate subsidies will stay in place for a maximum of 7 years.

Part B assistance provides for carry on assistance to those farmers whose businesses become unviable, in the short term, through severe downturn in market prices for their products. Again assistance will only be provided to those businesses which cannot obtain appropriate commercial credit and which have good prospects for the future.

Part C assistance is a welfare package designed to minimise hardship for those primary producers whose businesses will not support normal family living expenses. Household support provides for a family at the same rate as unemployment benefits, for up to three years. Rehabilitation grants provide up to $8 000 as a lump sum payment for primary producers who have to sell their properties and who are left with no cash resources after repaying debts.

The assistance package provides excellent support for those farmers who need to make adjustments to their businesses in order to survive and also for those people who are unable to survive in rural industries.

A fundamental change in funding arrangement has been introduced for the new Rural Adjustment Scheme. For previous schemes the Commonwealth has provided capital funds to States for on lending to farmers. These funds have been provided as 20 year loans bearing interest rates of 7 and 8 per cent per annum. Fifteen or 25 per cent of annual allocations have been provided to States as a grant. The new scheme requires States to borrow funds to finance loans to primary producers for Part A and Part B assistance. The Commonwealth provides annual allocations of interest subsidy to cover half of the borrowing costs incurred by States for Part A assistance and 25 per cent of borrowing costs for Part B assistance. The Commonwealth also provides contributions towards the administrative costs of the scheme. Part C assistance is wholly funded by the Commonwealth.

Whilst less generous than previous schemes the new Rural Adjustment Scheme provides a worthwhile assistance package for primary producers. In summary, this Bill adds significant support to previous Government initiatives which will support South Australian agriculture into the future.

Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 provides that the measure is deemed to have come into operation on the first day of July 1985. Clause 3 defines 'the agreement' as the agreement between the Commonwealth, the States and the Northern Territory in the form of the schedule.

Clause 4 provides that the execution on behalf of the State of the agreement is approved. Any act done by the Minister in anticipation is ratified. Clause 5 provides that the Rural Industry Assistance Act 1985 applies to the agreement.

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

RURAL INDUSTRY ASSISTANCE BILL

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD (Minister of Education): I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

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

Leave granted.

Explanation of Bill

In introducing this Bill to establish the 'Rural Industry Assistance Act 1985', the Government is again effecting rationalization of legislation in the interests of efficiency and is also making provisions for ongoing assistance to primary producers in South Australia.

The Bill repeals the Rural Industry Assistance (Special Provisions) Act 1971 and the Rural Industry Assistance Act 1977 and replaces them with the new Act which will cover residual responsibilities under the 1971 and 1977 Commonwealth-States Rural Adjustment Agreements and also will provide State legislation for the operation of the 1985 Rural Adjustment Agreement. The 1985 agreement, and any agreements arising in the future, will be individually formalised by the introduction of a short approving Bill.

This measure will allow transfer of surplus funds, which accumulate from the operation of previous Rural Adjustment Schemes, to the Rural Industry Adjustment and Development Fund. This fund was established under the Rural Industry Adjustment and Development Act 1985, which is designed to provide State funded assistance to primary producers in South Australia. This legislation represents a major Government initiative in support of South Australian agriculture and will assist in maintaining agriculture as a major force in the State's economy.

Clauses 1 and 2 are formal. Clause 3 provides for the interpretation of expressions used in the measure: 'farmer' means a person engaged in growing crops or rearing animals in this State; and 'protection certificate' means a protection certificate granted under this measure.

Clause 4 provides for the repeal of the Rural Industry Assistance (Special Provisions) Act 1971 and the Rural Industry Assistance Act 1977. Clause 5 provides that the measure applies to the two agreements referred to in the repealed Acts, and to any other agreement approved by Act of Parliament and declared by the Act of approval to be an

agreement to which this measure applies. Clause 6 provides that the Minister may establish separate funds for the purposes of each agreement to which the measure applies. Money may be paid into or out of a fund for the purposes of the agreement pursuant to which the fund is established or for any other purpose authorised by Act of Parliament.

Clause 7 provides that the Minister is authorised to carry out the terms of each agreement to which the measure applies. The Minister may delegate any power or function conferred on him by an agreement to which the measure applies. Clause 8 provides for the grant of protection certificates by the Minister to farmers. On granting a certificate the Minister must file a copy with the Registrar-General and cause notice to be published in the *Gazette*. The Minister must not grant a certificate unless the farmer has applied for assistance under an agreement to which the measure applies, there is a prospect that the farmer will be eligible for assistance, that unless the certificate is granted the farmer is unlikely to be able to continue farming or benefit from the assistance, and it is proper and desirable to grant a certificate.

Clause 9 provides that a list of all protection certificates be kept at the office of the Minister available for inspection on request. Clause 10 provides that a protection certificate protects a farmer from the commencement or continuation of proceedings for the recovery of any debt or damages. But the certificate does not prevent an action for damages for personal injury, proceedings under the Workers Comensation Act, 1971, proceedings authorised by regulation or proceedings authorised by the Minister.

Clause 11 provides that the protection certificate remains in force until cancelled. The Minister may cancel a certificate by notice in the *Gazette* if: the farmer abandons the farm or fails to operate it to the satisfaction of the Minister; the farmer contravenes or fails to comply with a condition of the certificate; the Minister considers that the farmer's circumstances do not warrant a certificate.

Clause 12 provides that, in determining a period of limitation, no account is to be taken of the period during which the defendant has been protected by a protection certificate. On the cancellation of a certificate, any proceedings suspended by the grant of the certificate may be continued. Clause 13 is the regulation making provision.

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

INDUSTRIES DEVELOPMENT ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. J.C. BANNON (Premier and Treasurer) obtained leave and introduced a Bill to amend the Industries Development Act 1941. Read a first time.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I move:

That this Bill be read a second time.

This Bill provides for Government guarantees to be given under the Industries Development Act to cover real or contingent liabilities rather than just loans, as is the present case. In recent times there has been an increasing number of requests for the Government to Guarantee financial facilities other than loans, particularly performance bonds. Strict interpretation of the Act as it now stands precludes the provision of guarantees for performance bonds and other contingent liabilities.

The inability of South Australian firms to obtain such guarantees can result in expansion and employment opportunities being lost to this State. The proposed amendment, while still limiting the Government's liability to a specified figure, will enable the guarantee provisions of the Act to be used more positively and effectively to assist South Australian industry. I seek leave to have the remainder of the second reading explanation inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

Explanation of Bill

Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 amends section 14 of the principal Act which provides for guarantees to assist the establishment, carrying on or expansion of businesses. At present section 14 does not authorise the Treasurer to give guarantees except with respect to the repayment of loans. The clause amends the section so that the Treasurer may also (subject, of course, to the recommendations of the Industries Development Committee) give a guarantee in respect of any other liability that has been or may be incurred in connection with a business or proposed business. Such a guarantee must meet the requirement that it is for the purpose of assisting a person to establish, carry on or expand a business in any industry; it must be limited to the payment of a fixed or ascertainable amount; and it must also meet or satisfy the other current requirements of section 14 (2). The amendments to section 14 (2) proposed by the clause are of a consequential nature only designed to apply the provisions to this new form of guarantee.

Clause 3 makes a consequential amendment to section 16 of the Act which empowers the Treasurer to make it a condition of a guarantee that the Treasurer may, if satisfied that the business is satisfactorily established, require the person who received the guarantee to raise capital to repay the loan in respect of which the guarantee was given. The clause makes consequential amendments to this section so that it relates only to guarantees in respect of loans.

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

PREVENTION OF CRUELTY TO ANIMALS BILL

The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT (Minister of Lands) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to discourage cruelty to animals; to repeal the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals Act 1936; and for other purposes.

The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

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

Leave granted.

Explanation of Bill

The purpose of this Bill is to rewrite South Australia's laws for the prevention of cruelty to animals in a form that is suitable for the 1980s and beyond. The existing legislation is one result of the movement in the latter half of the nineteenth century that saw the creation of the Royal Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals. At this time also there was written into the Police Act 1869 a section designed to stop some of the cruel or inhumane practices that occurred in a society that used animals as beasts of burden. By the turn of the century, enough public opinion had been aroused for the Government of the day to table in the House a Prevention of Cruelty to Animals Bill. This Bill became the Act of 1908 and forms the basis of the existing legislation. Despite amendments and consolidations over the years, many of the provisions still in force reflect the attitudes of a non-mechanised society, and are out of place in the late twentieth century.

Since the drafting of the original Act, there have been a number of changes in the way animals are used. We no longer rely on them for every day motive power, we use them in intensive agricultural systems, and we use them extensively in experiments and for testing new products. Accompanying these changes has been a change in community attitudes towards animals. Practices that were once carried out without question are now subjected to considerable scrutiny.

The most recent revival of the animal welfare movement began in the mid 1970s with the publication of several philosophical treatises. The most popular, 'Animal Liberation' by Professor Peter Singer, was a forceful call to arms, written for the general reader, on the subjects of intensive farming and the use of animals for research. As a result, there emerged in Australia strong community interest in the welfare of animals within the intensive husbandry industries and in those animals which were being exported for slaughter overseas, particularly sheep and horses, and that interest persists today. One practical result of this has been the creation of a Senate Select Committee on Animal Welfare which was set up in 1983 to examine the treatment of animals throughout Australia. It is therefore appropriate that this State's cruelty to animals laws should be reviewed at this time.

Soon after this Government came to office, a working party was formed consisting of representatives from the Department of Agriculture, the agricultural community, the Health Commission and animal welfare organisations, to examine amendments to the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals Act which had been proposed by the R.S.P.C.A. and to recommend to the Government those amendments that should be adopted. The process has been lengthy, due mainly to the amount of consultation that has occurred. There are many groups and individuals who have considerable expertise and interest in this matter, and the working party called for submissions from them at the beginning of their work. A draft Bill was circulated to those people who originally made submissions, and to many other interested organisations. The comments from this process have been of great help to the working party.

This Bill is the result of their work, and amongst other changes incorporates two important new initiatives. First, it creates an Animal Welfare Advisory Committee to advise the responsible Minister on all matters relating to animal welfare, and secondly it requires the licensing of research and teaching institutions that use animals. Both initiatives have been well received by those people likely to be affected by them and by animal welfare organisations.

The Animal Welfare Advisory Committee will consist of Government representatives, and representatives of agricultural and animal welfare organisations. The Committee is not intended as a representative one, but one that has the necessary expertise to provide advice on the administration of the Act, and to be a body to which specific inquiries can be directed. The committee will also be responsible for advising on the formulation of regulations which will be an important part of this measure.

Research or teaching institutions will be required to create Animal Ethics Committees to examine and approve all work using animals. Ethics committees will also have responsibility to ensure that animals used in their institutions are humanely treated.

The draft Bill circulated for comment had included fish within the definition of animal. Honourable members may recall the comments in the press claiming that such an inclusion would harm both the commercial and recreational fishing industries. Because there is conflicting evidence about the ability of fish to feel pain, the definition of animals in the Bill before honourable members specifically excludes fish, and I have set up a committee to examine the question fully and to recommend appropriate measures.

The offences clause, clause 13, is a consolidation of the offences previously scattered throughout the Act. Honourable members will note that the penalties have been substantially increased over those in the existing legislation. The Bill upgrades penalties to a maximum of $10 000 or 12 months imprisonment. This is in line with recent judicial comment and public opinion.

The powers of RSPCA inspectors will change. They will no longer be special constables but will have all the powers normally associated with inspectors appointed under legislation. They will have the power to enter any vehicle or premises where animals are kept for commercial purposes. They will also be able to forcibly enter premises or vehicles where they reasonably believe that offences have been committed. However, unless the inspector believes that the animal is suffering, or is in danger of suffering pain, that forcible entry can be carried out only after a warrant from a justice had been obtained. At present, in summer, when animals are locked in cars left in the sun, inspectors must find the driver of the car before the animals can be released. This often results in the animal dying of heat exhaustion. The new provision will enable them to take appropriate action to relieve this problem, whilst at the same time providing protection from unwarranted intrusion into private premises.

I would like to draw honourable members' attention to the regulating powers in clause 44, in particular subclause (3), which will enable those codes of practice that have been approved by the Animal Welfare Advisory Committee to be incorporated within the regulations. In particular, agricultural codes of practice can be incorporated, thus removing the necessity of providing a blanket exemption from the cruelty provisions as exists in the present legislation. This provision has been welcomed by the United Farmers and Stockowners Association and most farmers.

In summary, the Bill before honourable members today provides a modern legislative framework with which protection against cruelty to animals can be enforced, and should be an effective piece of legislation for the foreseeable future.

Clauses 1 and 2 are formal. Clause 3 provides for the interpretation of certain provisions used in the measure. Some of the more significant definitions are as follows: 'animal'—a member of any species of the sub-phylum vertebrata except a human being or a fish, and including prescribed animals; 'inspector'—means a member of the Police Force and an inspector under the measure; 'pain'—includes suffering and distress; 'the Society'—means the RSPCA (SA) Incorporated.

Clause 4 provides for the repeal of the prevention of Cruelty to Animals Act 1936. Clause 5 provides that the measure binds the Crown. Clause 6 provides for the establishment of the Animal Welfare Advisory Committee (the committee). Clause 7 deals with the term of office of members of the committee. Under the clause a member is appointed for a period not exceeding three years, and on the expiration of his term, is eligible for reappointment. A member may be removed from office by the Governor for mental or physical incapacity, dishonourable conduct or neglect of duty. A member's office becomes vacant if he dies, his term expires, he resigns or is removed by the Governor. On a vacancy occurring, the office must be filled under the measure. Clause 8 provides for the allowances and expenses to which members are entitled.

Clause 9 provides for the conduct of business of the committee. Clause 10 is a saving provision. Clause 11 provides for the office of secretary to the committee. Clause 12 sets out the functions of the committee—

to advise the Minister on any matter relating to the administration or enforcement of the measure;
to consider legislative proposals relating to animal welfare;
to examine codes of practice relating to animals;
to investigate and report on matters referred to it by the Minister.

Clause 13 provides that it is an offence to ill treat an animal punishable by a penalty of $10 000 or imprisonment for 12 months. The clause provides that without limiting the generality of the expression, a person ill treats an animal if:
he deliberately or unreasonably causes it unnecessary pain;
being its owner, he fails to provide it with appropriate and adequate food, water, shelter or exercise, he fails to alleviate any pain suffered by it (whether by reason of age, illness or injury), he abandons it or he neglects it so as to cause it unnecessary pain;
he releases it from captivity for the purpose of it then being hunted or killed by another animal;
he causes it to be killed or injured by another animal;
he organizes, participates in or is present at an event at which animals are encouraged to fight;
having injured the animal, he fails to take reasonable steps to alleviate its pain;
he kills it so as to cause it unnecessary pain;
he kills it in a manner contrary to regulations;
he transports it in a manner contrary to regulations;
he traps, snares or catches it contrary to the regulations;
he poisons it contrary to the regulations;
he cages or confines it contrary to the regulations.

Clause 14 provides that a person shall not use an electrical good or any other electrical device designed to control an animal in contravention of the regulations. The penalty provided is as under clause 13. Clause 15 provides that a person shall not carry out a medical or surgical procedure on an animal in contravention of the regulations. The penalty provided is as under clause 13. Clause 16 provides that a person is not to use an animal for teaching any science or for research or experimentation unless he holds a licence under the measure. The penalty under the provision is $50 000 in the case of a body corporate and $10 000 in the case of a natural person. A person who carries out such activities in the course of his employment by a licensee is not required to be licensed.

Clause 17 provides that persons may apply to the Minister for a licence. Clause 18 provides that, on an application for a licence being made, the Minister shall determine the application having regard to the suitability of the applicant to hold a licence, the adequacy of his premises and facilities, the adequacy of his arrangements for veterinary attention, and any prescribed matters. Clause 19 provides that a licence is subject to such conditions as the Minister may impose. Without limiting the range of possible condititons, conditions may be imposed—
requiring the licensee to establish an animal ethics committee;
requiring the licensee to consult with an animal ethics committee in relation to specified matters;
requiring the licensee to seek the approval of an animal ethics committee before acquiring animals for teaching, research or experimentation, or using animals for teaching, research or experimentation;
requiring the licensee to provide an animal ethics committee with such information in relation to teaching research or experimentation involving animals as is requested;
requiring the licensee to answer questions put to him by an animal ethics committee in relation to teaching, research or experimentation involving animals.

The Minister may vary or revoke conditions or impose further conditions.

Clause 20 provides that a licence remains in force, subject to the measure, for two years and may be renewed for successive periods of two years. Clause 21 provides that a licensee may surrender his licence to the Minister. Clause 22 provides that where a licensee has been found guilty of an offence under the measure, has obtained the licence improperly or failed to comply with a condition the Minister may revoke or suspend the licence. Clause 23 provides that the Minister may establish such number of animal ethics committees as he thinks necessary. Where a licensee is required, as a condition of his licence, to establish an animal ethics committee, he shall do so in accordance with this clause. A committee shall consist of at least four members appointed by the Minister of whom:
at least one person who is a veterinary surgeon;
at least one person engaged in teaching or research activities involving animals;
at least one person responsible for the daily care of animals kept for teaching or research;
at least one person with an established committment to the welfare of animals.

The Minister must ensure that the composition of a committee contains an even balance of such persons. A member of an animal ethics committee is entitled to receive:
in the case of a committee established by the Minister—allowances determined by the Governor;
in the case of a committee established by a licensee—such allowance as is agreed by the licensee and the member of the committee.

A member of a committee shall be appointed for a term not exceeding two years.

Clause 24 provides for the procedure of animal ethics committees. Clause 25 provides that the functions of an animal ethics committee are:
to determine matters required under the measure to be referred to a committee by the licensee;
to approve the use of animals for teaching, research or experimentation proposed to be undertaken by a licensee;
to approve the acquisition, by a licensee, of animals for the purpose of teaching, research or experimentation;
to ensure that animals involved in teaching, research or experimentation are treated humanely and that the regulations relating to such activities are complied with;
to prepare annual returns for the Minister containing the prescribed information in relation to matters referred to the committee under this measure.
any prescribed functions.

A committee may approve the use of animals for teaching, research or experimentation conditionally or unconditionally. An animal ethics committee is not to approve the use of an animal for research or experimentation, or the acquisition of animals for such activities, unless satisfied that the activity is essential for the purpose of obtaining significant scientific data and the person who proposes to use the animal has appropriate experience and qualifications.

Clause 26 provides for appeals to the Minister against decisions of animal ethics committees. The Minister is not to determine an appeal unless the Animal Welfare Advisory Committee has investigated, and furnished the Minister with a report on the appeal. The Minister may confirm, vary or reverse the decision appealed against.

Clause 27 provides for appeals to the Supreme Court from decisions of the Minister. Provision is made for requiring the Minister to give written reasons for his decision. Clause 28 provides that the Governor may, by notice in the *Gazette*, appoint a person nominated by the society to be the Chief Inspector and persons nominated by the society to be inspectors. The Minister is to provide inspectors with certificates of identification.

Clause 29 sets out the powers of inspectors. An inspector may:

- at any reasonable time, enter any premises that are licensed under this measure or the Meat Hygiene Act, 1980, being used by a licensee under this measure for a purpose for which he is required to be licensed or being used by a licensee under the Meat Hygiene Act, 1980, for a purpose for which he is required to be licensed under that Act;
- at any reasonable time, enter any premises or vehicle that is being used for holding or confining animals that have been herded or collected together for sale, transport or any other commercial purpose;
- where he reasonably suspects an offence against this measure to have been committed on premises or a vehicle, enter or break into the premises or stop and detain the vehicle.

Under subclause (2), while in premises or a vehicle the inspector may:

- ask questions;
- take copies of documents;
- examine any animal, and where he suspects an animal to be suffering unnecessary pain, seize and remove it for treatment and care;
- inspect any object;
- where he suspects on reasonable grounds that an offence has been committed, seize and remove any evidence of the offence;
- take photographs, etc;
- require a licensee or permit holder to produce the licence or permit.

Under subclause (3), an inspector is not to exercise the power of breaking and entering except on the authority of a warrant issued by a justice, unless the inspector believes an animal is suffering unnecessary pain and that urgent action is required. Under subclause (4), the justice must not issue a warrant unless satisfied by information on oath that there are reasonable grounds to suspect an offence has been committed under the measure and a warrant is reasonably required. Under subclause (5), where an inspector believes the condition of an animal to be such that it should not be worked, he may by notice in writing direct the owner to rest it, give it food, water or treatment, and require the owner to ensure that the animal is not used for specified purposes for any specified period.

An inspector may be accompanied by assistants (subclause (6)). It is an offence to hinder or obstruct an inspector, penalty $1 000 (subclause (7)). Under subclause (8) a person must answer to the best of his knowledge, information and belief a question asked by an inspector, penalty $1 000 unless the answer would tend to incriminate him (subclause (9)). A person given a direction or a requirement must comply with it (subclause (10)).

Clause 30 provides that where a veterinary surgeon or inspector is of the opinion that the condition of an animal is, by reason of age, illness or injury, such that it is so weak or disabled or in such pain that it ought to be killed he may kill it (subclause (1)). Under subclause (2), an inspector shall not exercise that power without the owner's consent unless, where the owner is not present, he has been unable to contact the owner after taking reasonable steps, and, where the owner is present and does not consent, he has obtained a warrant from a justice authorizing the killing of the animal. Under subclause (3) the justice shall not issue the warrant unless satisfied on information on oath that in the circumstances the animal should be killed. Under subclause (4) the inspector incurs no civil liability for the killing.

Clause 31 provides that it is an offence to pretend that one is an inspector, penalty $1 000. Clause 32 provides immunity from liability for inspectors for acts or omissions done in good faith. Clause 33 provides that where an animal is injured in an accident involving a vehicle, the person in charge of the vehicle shall take such steps as are resonably practicable in the circumstances to inform the owner of the animal of its injury, and, where after taking such steps, he has been unable to contact the owner, inform an inspector, within 24 hours of the accident occurring, of the circumstances surrounding the accident, penalty $1 000.

Clause 34 provides that it is an offence to conduct a rodeo unless a permit has been issued, penalty $1 000. An application for a permit must be made to the Minister in the prescribed form with the prescribed fee. The permit may be issued for such period, and subject to such conditions, as are specified in the permit.

Clause 35 provides that, where a person believes on reasonable grounds that over a period of 24 hours or more an animal has not been provided with adequate food or water, the person may, with the authority of an inspector, enter the premises for the purpose of providing the animal with food and water.

Clause 36 provides that where the owner of an animal is convicted of an offence against the measure in respect of the animal, the court may make an order directing the person to surrender the animal to an inspector, and forbidding the person to acquire, or have custody of, any other animal or any other animal of a specified class, either until further order, or for a specified period. A person bound by such an order must comply with it, penalty $1 000. Clause 37 provides for the service of notices.

Clause 38 provides that where a body corporate is guilty of an offence against the measure, every member of the governing body of the body corporate is guilty of an offence and liable to the same penalty prescribed for the principal offence unless he proves that he could not by the exercise of reasonable diligence have prevented the commission of the offence. Clause 39 makes provision with respect to continuing offences.

Clause 40 provides that where a person commits an offence against the measure in the course of his employment, his employer is guilty of an offence (penalty $5 000). Under subclause (2) it is a defence to a charge of such an offence for the defendant to prove that he could not, by the exercise of reasonable diligence, have prevented the commission of the offence by the employee. Clause 41 provides that the offences constituted by the measure are summary offences. Clause 42 is an evidentiary provision. Clause 43 provides that the Act does not render unlawful any practice done in accordance with a prescribed code of practice relating to animals. Clause 44 is the regulation making provision.

The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD secured the adjournment of the debate.

APPROPRIATION BILL

Adjourned debate on motion of Hon. J.C. Bannon:

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

(Continued from 8 October. Page 1152.)

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): I thought it would be appropriate in this debate, which is for the purpose of noting the deliberations of the Estimates Committees, to report to the House on the Estimates Committees with which I was involved. They involved the Minister of Labour, who unfortunately is also Minister for three other major portfolios, and this makes a complete farce of the Premier's reshuffle. We in fact had a whole two hours, or a quarter of the day, to examine that very important portfolio encompassed by the Minister of Labour. Instead of having a complete day, as one would normally expect when a Minister has a normal ministerial load, we had two hours. It is a complete travesty of any sense of ministerial responsibility to suggest that a Minister, no matter how fancy his footwork (and the Hon. Mr Blevins is certainly noted for that) can be Minister of Labour and carry three other major portfolios. It is plainly absurd.

Mr Becker: Who else could do it?

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: That is the point—they had to put their fancy tap dancer up front, because at the moment they have to try to keep the public at bay until the election. We did have time to explore with that Minister the question of workers compensation, and the debate was quite illuminating. The Minister has claimed, loudly and publicly, that all our problems relating to workers compensation stem from the fact that private insurance companies handle the business. We had a look at the Auditor-General's Report and the budget papers, and we found (I will not say to our astonishment) that the Government bill for workers compensation had blown out to no less than $31 million in one year, and that was after it had budgeted for $17 million.

Private insurance companies have nothing whatsoever to do with Government workers compensation insurance. That fact was pointed out to the Minister, and it was also pointed out that it was rather difficult to sheet the blame home to the private insurance companies for the total failure of the workers compensation legislation (which was the brain child of the Labor Party), because those companies were not involved in any Government workers compensation. So he was at a loss to answer that.

He was questioned about the timetable for workers compensation. The Government has spent a deal of taxpayers' funds on publicising the fact that there had been agreement reached by two of the major employer organisations—the Chamber of Commerce and Industry and the Metal Industries Association—and the Trades and Labor Council. This was proclaimed loudly and widely to the public in expensive newspaper advertisements, but they had to be promptly withdrawn because it was found that the Trades and Labor Council had not agreed and was demanding 22 amendments, so the agreement had not been struck and the package was withdrawn.

The Minister knew precious little about this, but he did say, when questioned, that the Government was ready to go when the parties had reached agreement. It was suggested to the Minister that perhaps the Government had some responsibility in this matter; that it was not a terribly good doctrine to be espousing that, if somebody outside government could agree a package, that was the last word, the gospel, and therefore would be accepted. I suggested to the Minister that the Government had some responsibility to the public at large in these matters, and that perhaps it would be a good idea if the Government had some ideas of its own on what would be a fit and proper package before it decided to bring legislation to the House.

Despite all this, we got precious little from the Minister. He was quite happy to let things float along and hope that in due course those people could reach agreement and that the Government might be able to keep the promise it made some three years ago to bring in new legislation. I do not want to dwell any longer on the Minister of Labour, because we did not get far with him. We did, however, have a whole day in which to examine the Estimates in relation to the Minister of Mines and Energy. I was appalled, and continue to be appalled, at the absolute refusal of that Minister to give any information of any value to the Committee. It was an appalling performance.

I will instance a number of examples of that. I raised early in the examination of the budget the question of gas supplies to South Australia. I have done it every year since this Government came to office, and I quoted to the Minister what he said in this very Chamber in October 1983. He has always been very bullish on this question of gas supplies to South Australia. He has always been out there on a wing and a prayer, the supreme optimism shining through: 'all will be well'. This is what he said two years ago:

> Today's announcement is a landmark. Finally laying to rest the myth that gas supplies to South Australia would cease in 1987 the Government will be seeking increased efforts in gas exploration and development from the producers to further enhance the security of South Australia's long-term supplies. Security of supply and price will be the key issues for discussion with producers in ensuing negotiations. The Government's efforts to pursue gas sharing, the establishment of petrochemical plant and to deal with the question of the AGL-PASA price differential are continuing.

This was October 1983, so I reminded the Minister of it. I did make one observation during that Committee. For all the hoo-ha about the Bill the Minister brought in about energy planning, all this window dressing on the eve of an election, the No. 1 problem confronting this State in relation to energy planning is the question of adequate and reasonably priced gas supplies. He did agree with that. We asked him a question after that ministerial statement, on that day two years ago:

> What discussion has the Premier had with the New South Wales Premier or others in relation to rationalising gas prices paid?

The Premier did not answer: the Minister of Mines and Energy answered:

> I am not saying that this question is totally solved to date. I am saying there has been some progress in a matter which needed to be solved. I am confident that further progress can be made, as I have indicated in the statement given to the House today.

He concluded:

> I have had indications from Mr Williams, of AGL, it is very happy to enter sharing negotiations, and these matters are inextricably linked; the question of price, the price paid and the question of sharing. So I indicate in answer to the question that the matter is being addressed, that the proper time for disclosure of what is proposed is when it is commenced, and that at that time the Deputy Leader can expect further information.

I have got no further information in the ensuing two years and I could not get any more out of him during the Estimates Committee, although the negotiations have commenced.

Let us just examine what the Minister said. I asked, 'When did the negotiations really start?' He said that two years ago they were under way but they only started this year in earnest. I asked him who was on the negotiating team, because that had been a moveable feast; there have been people in and out of these negotiations. We finished up with the only members of the negotiating team being Mr Guerin, the Premier (who came sometimes), and the Minister, (who came sometimes). The Government started negotiations this year, mark you, on these fundamental questions of gas-sharing, price and reserves. I asked this question about reserves:

> Is it very sensible to agree a price for this gas if we do not know what amount of gas we are talking about and what the reserves are?

I repeated to him what he said two years ago, that the questions of price and reserves were inextricably linked.

The Minister agreed with me that they are inextricably linked. I said:

> What about reserves? I understand there is an independent group up in the Cooper Basin examining the reserves.

The Minister said. 'Yes, they are going to report mid-December at the earliest.' I said. 'Is the price still inextricably linked with the reserves?' He said, 'Yes.' I said:

> How do you justify two things: first, the statements made publicly by the Government that the question of price was about to be settled, that we are on the eve of settlement of this price and, secondly, how do you justify a schedule of electricity tariffs with a 2 per cent drop now, conveniently on the eve of an election, and holding them below CPI next year, when you do not know how much you are going to have to pay for your principal source of fuel?

Eighty per cent of our electricity is produced from burning gas and the Government does not know what it is going to pay for gas. The Minister, of course, had no answer. However, he was quite happy to assert that there is nothing phoney about the announcement of ETSA tariffs, even though the Government has no idea what it will have to pay for its major fuel, namely, natural gas from the Cooper Basin, nor will not know what the reserves are until at least mid-December, and it does not know what it will pay for it. No wonder the Minister was floundering.

We moved on to the question of land rights. We saw the Premier and the Minister of Community Welfare do a quick soft shoe shuffle in this Chamber when questioned on that: the impending federal legislation would have no effect at all on South Australia because we are good boys, we have legislation in place, and it will not worry us. I pointed out to the Minister that he was abysmally ignorant if he shared the view of his colleagues, because the federal legislation will be all encompassing. It will embrace all the States and the principles of the model include land claims being allowed on former Aboriginal reserve land, vacant Crown land, and Commonwealth parks, as long as they are kept as parks.

There will be no veto over exploration or mining on Aboriginal land, and final decisions will rest with the Federal Government. There will be compensation for actual damage or disturbance to land, not taking into account the value of minerals, etc., discovered. An independent tribunal will be set up to handle disputes on exploration and land claims. This is all independent of South Australia, in South Australia. Commonwealth and State laws are to be made consistent with the preferred model. The report states that the Federal Government will have the overall say on land rights, including the power to slap the wrist of any State which loses its way or refuses to pull into line. Moreover, a land claims mechanism will have to be set up whereby Aboriginal groups can make claims, and they will be heard by this tribunal and land granted quite irrespective of any wishes of the South Australian Government.

I was appalled to learn from the Minister that, first, he did not believe it was any matter that should concern him. How could a Minister be so out of touch with the industry he purports to represent, the mining industry, as to not know that that is a matter of grave concern to it?

It was not his baby—it was for the Minister for Community Welfare. Land rights had nothing to do with the Minister of Mines and Energy. He had no discussions at all with Mr Holding in Canberra in relation to this State's interests. They would make their submissions at the right time. After Federal Cabinet had made a decision, which is about to be passed into law, I suggest that the right time may just have passed them by. However, the Minister again shows no interest or concern and has no knowledge of this critical question which is of vital concern to the industry that he is supposed to be looking after in the interests of the people of this State.

We went on to the question of the petrochemical plant. The Minister knew nothing of what was happening there. That has been announced and reannounced *ad nauseum* since 1973 by the Labor Party. That is why it irresponsibly sold gas and guaranteed it to the Sydney market to the year 2006 without looking to our own needs. In two years time, unless we have resolved the issue, we will have a major problem. We have not solved the problem, and this Government is no closer to solving it. The petrochemical plant is, to all intents and purposes, up the spout.

I asked the Minister about markets for Roxby and referred to an *Advertiser* report written when the Premier was in Japan trying to promote sales to that country. The newspaper reports were of some concern to us, as they stated that the Japanese had doubts about Australia's ability to supply. No wonder they have doubts because I quoted to the Minister his dissenting report when he was shadow Minister for Mines. He and the shadow Environment Minister (the now Deputy Premier) wrote a dissenting report to that select committee which we had set up into the Roxby indenture. They were trying to can the project. They were doing all they could to stop it. I quoted to the Minister some extracts from his dissenting report of three years ago wherein he said that the uranium would find its way into bombs and that the safety provisions were not adequate. I asked whether he had moved to amend the safety provisions, as they were the toughest in the world. He wonders why the Japanese doubt Australia's ability to supply.

I also asked the Government where was the agreement to proceed. The budget papers said that an announcement would be made in September for the go ahead for Roxby Downs, and that has been stated publicly. September has gone. Where is the announcement to proceed? The Minister said that he had had talks with the Japanese Ambassador and that everything was all right with the Japanese.

I was not going to mention the people to whom I talked, but I also spoke with the Japanese Ambassador when he was in South Australia. He indicated that they were cautious about the question. One did not have to be a genius to read between the lines: they were looking for more stability from the Labor Party federally and in this State on the question of uranium production and sales before they were assured of long-term security of supply. No wonder people overseas think that we are eccentric on this question—that was the very word used to me.

I spoke to people at the Central Generating Board in London who had written contracts for Australia to supply uranium. Two mines were closed down—Jabiluka and Koongarra. I asked what they were going to do, and they said that they would buy uranium for their power plants from Canada. No wonder we are seen as eccentric overseas when the Labor Party closes down some mines and change its mind on Roxby Downs in the heat of an election campaign. They wonder why the Japanese have doubts about our attitude to uranium.

I do not wish to delay the House unduly, but, as the day was dragging on, I asked the Minister how far he had got with the committee that had been set up to look at ETSA tariffs. I got nothing from him on that, except that he had a recommendation to remove the 10 per cent loading on electricity on some parts of Eyre Peninsula. I told the Minister that he did not have to set up a committee to make that decision, as it was a Government decision. I pointed out that he had refused to do it when in government before and that the Liberal Party had refused to do it when in government. It is a Government decision. So, he set up the committee as the heat was on the Government in regard to electricity tariffs.

Months ago, the Government set up a committee to look at the question of ETSA tariffs and it has only a recom-

mendation to cut out the 10 per cent loading on tariffs on the far Eyre Peninsula. I ask you! I suggested to the Minister that, in the development of our mineral resources, the record of this Government over three years had been miserable. The Minister tried, in a very low key way, to suggest that he had some runs on the board, but at the end of the day I could not see any score on the board at all: I could see only lost opportunities because of their policies and insecurity.

I was worried and concerned as to where we are in this State on these basic questions that are so vital and of such importance to these industries and to the public of South Australia. There has been no effective progress over the past three years in relation to our gas supplies. There is no knowledge of federal Aboriginal land rights and, if they have knowledge, they have deliberately sought to mislead the Parliament. This Minister completely washed his hands of it, as he is not interested, although it is a matter of vital concern to the mining industry. So, the sorry tale went on. Fortunately, the public of South Australia will not have to endure this sorry spectacle much longer.

This Government is on the skids—even the Minister occupying the front bench said exactly that last week during his Estimates Committee. He said, tongue in cheek, he now says (although it is a funny subject on which to be tongue in cheek), that the member for Light would be occupying his chair if he read the mood of the electorate correctly. He rushed up to his Leader yesterday to try to square off. How can one square off and claim he has tongue in cheek when one is talking about reading the mood of the electorate? The poor old Minister, in one of those rare flashes of insight and honesty, stated that. It is a gem that we must hold on to, as such pearls are not cast before us often.

Mr Ashenden: What did he say?

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: He said to the member for Light that it would not be long before he would be occupying his chair as Minister of Housing and Construction because, if he read the mood of the electorate correctly, the Labor Party had had it.

Members interjecting:

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mrs Appleby): Order!

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: Yes, he is a realist. On that note, I assure the Minister that we appreciated that one rare flash of insight, which happens all too infrequently. I was most disappointed by the lack of information and interest of these Ministers from whom I had the misfortune to try to extract information—it just was not there.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON (Murray): I want to refer tonight to a couple of matters that were raised during the Estimates Committee debate. The first matter concerns the spillage that occurred down at Port Adelaide two weeks ago. I will refer only briefly to it as I intend to say more about this matter tomorrow. I have very grave concerns about the way in which the Government has acted in this matter. It has been a complete debacle from the start.

In fact, if we look back at the Estimates, we see that my colleague the member for Mitcham raised such matters as toxic spills and questioned the Minister for Environment and Planning on the subject. The Minister's response was that safeguards, referring to the matter of spillages, etc., were quite reasonable and adequate. However, as my colleague the member for Mitcham pointed out, a week later when the system was put to the test, it failed miserably. I have referred to the Government's lack of action following the approval of recommendations which were put before Cabinet back in December 1984 and which set down direct guidelines on what the Government should do under such circumstances.

Two specific recommendations were approved. The first was that, on the occasion of a spillage, it was the responsibility of the authority that was contacted first immediately—not a day or a couple of days later, but immediately—to contact other authorities. We recognise that two weeks ago that did not happen. For example, the Metropolitan Fire Service, which now has magnificent equipment to treat such disasters, was not notified until the following day.

The second significant recommendation was that the Government was to review the guidelines. A special committee was to be set up under the chairmanship of a person from the Department of Lands, and that committee would have the responsibility of reviewing the guidelines. However, it has never been set up. It took eight months for a Premier's directive to go out regarding the first regulation to which I referred, namely, that all responsible authorities had to be notified immediately. I suggest that, if the committee to which I have referred had been set up we would not have the serious situation that we now have. Let us move a little further down the track.

The Minister for Environment and Planning has acted quite irresponsibly in his handling of this matter. So many questions are unanswered at this time. I strongly support the comments that have been made by the Chairman of the Conservation Council in South Australia, Dr Coulter, who has considerable expertise in this subject. Many other people with similar expertise have contacted me in recent days expressing grave concern about what is happening down there and the way in which the Government is handling this situation.

I refer to a letter that was forwarded to the Minister by Dr Coulter. I was fortunate that Dr Coulter forwarded me a copy of that letter. Basically, he expresses urgency in relation to having the clay removed as soon as possible. Dr Coulter sets out in detail why the copper chromium arsenic elements that were spilt at Port Adelaide should be removed. He says that he is particularly concerned that the Minister might not be getting full and comprehensive advice on all aspects of the problem posed by the spill. So many other people have reiterated that same point.

We recognise, if we look at genetic toxicity, that all three elements in this spill are acutely toxic, and, of course, that is why they are used: they cause death at sufficiently high concentration. We recognise that they are used for killing wood fungi and bacteria which can attack treated timber, etc.

In a statement in the *Advertiser* this morning, the Minister referred to the low levels. He also referred to levels in the drain in which the chemical had been held and suggested that they were being diluted by incoming rainwater and would gradually be released. I would concur in that, and can only support what Dr Coulter has said, namely, that it is the very low concentrations and not the high concentrations that are very significant when considering genetic toxicity. There is a misconception that is pointed out by the Chairman of the Conservation Council, even among many public health scientists about the effect of dilution in relation to genetically toxic agents. Concerning the adsorption of these elements into the clay and the leaching that may follow he says:

> Thus the low concentration of arsenic, chromium and copper remaining in the water of the swamp behind the North Arm sluice gate is not surprising; it is to be expected.

However, he warns:

> Once in the marine environment of the Port River Estuary these toxic elements will spread through the estuary by a mixture of physical and biological processes. At all times the concentration in the water will be extremely low. This observation alone will give no clue as to spread or significance. It has been pointed out that this estuary is already heavily polluted with a soup of industrial discharges over the last century. Creatures living in the

estuary have learned to cope with this pollution. This should not be used as a justification for loading more pollution into the area.

There are several mechanisms by which the material now in the clay in the swamp may be released to the water if it is allowed to remain in situ . . . there will be a slow leaching into the water over successive winters. But the drain emptying into this swamp drains a major industrial area of Port Adelaide. Much of this land is yet to be occupied and who knows what other chemicals will come to be handled and spilled into this drain in future years?

Dr Coulter indicates that it should be noted that memory of these spills fades with time. That is a particular concern that I have: we are being told that everything is all right, that we do not need to worry about anything, and that we should just rest and forget about it. If the copper chromium arsenic is left in the clay, who will recall this fact if, five years from now, a spill of potent leaching agent which itself may be relatively harmless passess through the very same swamp into the Port River? Dr Coulter goes on to say:

Even though these elements may be bound to the clay in the swamp now one can not be certain that they could not be leached and transported to the Port River at some future time.

I support strongly what Dr Coulter is saying in relation to the need to have this clay removed as soon as practicable. I realise that it may be an expensive exercise, but surely, when we recognise the dangers that may be alleviated as a result of having this clay removed at this stage, it is worth every penny of it. The coming summer provides an excellent opportunity to remove the clay.

Let us forget about the cost but make sure that that area is safe for future generations. That surely must be our first consideration. I can only urge the Minister to take more note than he has already taken of those who have the expertise in this matter—Dr Coulter being one. As I mentioned earlier, there are many others who have continued to warn the Minister of problems that will arise out of this very dangerous situation if remedial action is not taken as soon as possible and the clay is removed. I can only urge the Minister take that action and stop suggesting that everything is all right, because it is particularly irresponsible of the Minister if he continues along that line.

The Minister must listen to some further opinions. If the Minister is not getting the right advice, I suggest that he listen to people concerned about the seriousness of the situation at present. Along the same lines, I want to refer to a timber plant approval given in the South-East in the Penola district. This matter has received much attention recently, and I have received a considerable number of representations on the matter. At a meeting of the Penola District Council approval was granted for the project. Many people have expressed concern about the matter. I want to refer to a letter from the Minister for Environment and Planning to the Managing Director of one of the large wineries in the South-East. In particular the Minister states:

I can fully appreciate your concern over the possible effects a proposal such as this may have on the special qualities and character of an area like the Coonawarra.

I am sure every member of this House would recognise those qualities. The letter continues:

However, regarding this proposal I should point out that I can only become involved where an environmental impact statement is required or where a council writes to me requesting that the South Australian Planning Commission act as the planning authority.

I would have thought that in a matter like this the Minister might call for an environmental impact statement. It is not a large development, but I would suggest that the ramifications that might come from a development such as this are very significant indeed. For that reason the Minister should have called for a statement to be prepared so that proper information could be provided.

I want to refer to some notes that were provided to the District Council of Penola prior to this decision being made. It is suggested that no matter what precautions are taken the serious potential for pollution still exists. There are many instances in the world of safeguards not having worked, and examples are listed. The next question posed is: how would the operation be policed to ensure that pollution has not occurred? It is suggested that it would be a very costly operation for council as the body with primary responsibility. The timber industry draft standards DR85027 and DR85028 clearly indicate that such a preservation plant should not be placed in an area where pollution can occur. In fact, it states that it is quite likely that the land would be permanently affected by the chemicals.

A number of concerns have been expressed about possible problems that might come out of the development of this works in that area. Of course the major problem involves the water supply. The sensitivity of the underground water supply in the South-East is recognised. I would have thought that, because of that, if for no other reason, the Minister would request the very best advice possible: that advice could have been obtained from an environmental impact assessment. It is rather disappointing that the Minister, although recognising the specific qualities of the area and the concerns with regard to the water catchment, as pointed out in his letter, has stood back and not called for an environmental impact assessment of the proposal.

I realise that time is limited, but I now want to raise a matter that I raised with the Minister for Environment and Planning during the Estimates Committee proceedings. I refer again to a matter concerning the town of Hahndorf. I could not guess the number of times that I have raised matters relating to this town in the 10 years that I have represented the area. But there are so many areas that need to be watched very carefully. Tonight I refer to the historic Hahndorf Academy, which again has been placed on the market for sale. I direct my comments particularly to the Premier and the Minister of Education. It is felt generally (and I know the owner of the property certainly feels this way, and I support him) that the building is far too important to be misused by a purchaser who may buy the property for commercial reasons rather than the education and cultural purposes for which it is well suited.

I am sure that many members of this House have visited the Hahndorf Academy and that they recognise the qualities of that facility. In fact, it is generally recognised that both the academy and Edmund Wright House were the two buildings to which much consideration was originally given in relation to their heritage significance and the necessity for preservation, and that that consideration did a great deal to ensure that people in South Australia were aware of their responsibility for heritage items. So, the Hahndorf Academy still stands.

Many school children, both primary and secondary, visit the building and, of the 30 years that the current owner of the gallery has operated art galleries in Hahndorf, 18 years have been spent at the Academy itself. It includes a five room German folk museum upstairs, and the owner has indicated that during the past 18 years he has had the opportunity and the pleasure of meeting dignitaries from all parts of the world, including HRH the Duke of Edinburgh, Sir Zelman Cowen (a former Governor-General), State Governors, ambassadors, consuls, and so on.

This has become an important centre as far as schools are concerned. Further, because of its prominent location in the heart of historic Hahndorf and its association with the name of Heysen, the academy has become internationally known and is the main reason for much of the influx of tourists into Hahndorf. The current owner has suggested that the academy should be saved and in fact should become

the centre for the Heysen collection in South Australia. The owner has referred to his experience over the past 18 years and has stated that a common complaint of visitors to South Australia has been the lack of Heysen works on display at the Art Gallery of South Australia. Visitors also go to Hahndorf hoping to view the full range of Heysen's works. However, the academy has only a limited number of drawings in one room only. Disappointment is often reflected on the faces of overseas visitors to the academy.

I believe that it would be a tremendous cultural asset (as well as financial) to South Australia if that academy became the Heysen Academy. The full works of Heysen from the Art Gallery of South Australia—and there are many—could be displayed in its 13 rooms, downstairs and upstairs. There is also a cottage attached which could be used for the purpose. This would draw many visitors to South Australia, because they would be able to observe the Heysen paintings and prints in one gallery.

The setting up of a Heysen gallery in the late Sir Hans Heysen's home town of Hahndorf would be a permanent monument to his memory, and I am sure that it would also give much pleasure to the Heysen family and the people of South Australia. I recognise, as do all members of the House, that the name of Heysen has again been recognised through the electoral system, in that after the next election we will have an electorate of Heysen, and I will be privileged in representing that electorate.

The Heysen family was very concerned when, following the previous redistribution, the electorate of Heysen was abolished and the name was lost temporarily from the electoral system. I am delighted, and I know that the Heysen family is particularly pleased, that the name has been reinstated in the electoral system in South Australia. I urge the Premier to give serious consideration to my suggestion, as it would mean a great deal to South Australia and to Hahndorf, the birthplace of Sir Hans Heysen. I hope that the Minister and, because of its educational value, the Minister of Education might give serious thought to the State's being able to continue with the Hahndorf Academy as a Heysen centre in South Australia.

Mr S.G. EVANS (Fisher): I do not accept that there is a shortage of accommodation in Adelaide, as I said in the Estimates Committee when raising the issue with the Minister. I take up the matter in this debate, because here I have a greater opportunity to express my views and some points put to me by people who would be interested in making accommodation available if the laws of our land—Federal, State and local government—were structured in such a way that people were encouraged to use them.

For example, many aged people in our community live in large homes in suburbs where councils will not condone senior citizens complexes, because by-laws disallow that sort of zoning, and neighbours also object if councils try to change the law. So, there is a catch 22 situation. In many cases, people would be happy to restructure their homes to create another unit for someone to live in if they were encouraged to do so.

If they are pensioners, automatically we would say that if they let a part of their home we would tax them by reducing their pension. There is no incentive for people to go out of their way to make available accommodation for those who are homeless in our city. Some would argue that people should not benefit from renting part of their home just because they are aged, but they do not necessarily have to be aged. We would be wise to allow anyone living on a pension and who is in a position to make accommodation available to do so and to collect rent without its affecting their pension.

I am worried about the federal law, but the idea should be considered. We could say that it was for the home in which they lived and that we are not giving an opportunity for someone to make a fortune. We would also have to say that rent charged for such accommodation should be set by the housing authority—in this case the Housing Trust. I do not believe that anyone should be able to use this as a rip off to get money without paying tax, but we could set a reasonable rental for accommodation in both the private and public sectors, then rents could be kept down to accommodate the disadvantaged. We would also take the burden off the Housing Trust, which would not have to provide accommodation for a family that could not afford to buy or pay normal rent in the private sector.

For every 100 families that need to be housed in Housing Trust accommodation, being unable to find housing in other sectors due to their economic position, we would save $5 million, even if the homes were worth only $50 000 to establish. That is not an insignificant amount of money.

Elderly people may be prepared to take in a couple of young people who perhaps through unfortunate circumstances at home could be wandering the streets. They could benefit from the care and attention given by elderly people who have been through the rigours and pitfalls, as well as the successes, of life. However, that would be a decision for the senior people or those needing accommodation, not the authority. Some caring people would like to take on that challenge.

We have thousands of rooms or part houses in Adelaide and throughout South Australia that are vacant only because of the law. I have talked mainly about pensioners, but many people in our community have been superannuated, may have worked in a small business, who have put a little aside for some form of investment while working for wages, who have retired either through illness or retrenchment, and who have suddenly found that the inflationary trend is eating away at their standard of living to the point where they are struggling to be as well off as some pensioners who get concessions for the telephone, public transport, council and water rates. We could also ask those people to make accommodation available in the home in which they live. I do not mean that they should buy houses and restore them, but we would explain that the State housing authority would decide the rent and that they would not be taxed on it.

The State and the rest of the country would save money, because the housing authority would not have to provide as much accommodation. Although the income tax benefit would be lost to the Federal Government, that Government is making most of the money available for subsidised housing for authorities such as the Housing Trust anyway. If one balanced it out, one would probably find that the federal authority would be better off.

We as parliamentarians—and the Ministers through their good offices—should talk to the Federal Government, which has a similar philosophy, and point out that here is an opportunity to save money and to house the disadvantaged in our community. However, to achieve that goal we also must talk to local government. I know that some of my colleagues get quite excited at the suggestion that perhaps we should allow people in residential zone 1A areas to divide their houses so that someone else can live with them.

I pose a question to those people who use that argument. In my home there were five children, all of whom, except one, stayed at home virtually until they were married, plus my wife and myself, which makes a total of seven people living in one home. In relation to the environment, what is the difference between that situation and one elderly person living in a big home, dividing the house and letting one half to three, four or five people?

A person living in his own home will not let a portion of it in a way that causes trouble to the community, because the tenant will also cause trouble to that elderly person. The landlord will make an assessment of the prospective tenant. I know the argument is raised that, once that occurs, new units are created in council areas and a host of undesirable people will move into the community. Nobody can decide who their neighbours will be.

Mr Groom: You can't choose your neighbours, Stan.

Mr S.G. EVANS: That is right. I will not go any further—I will keep the Party political situation out of it.

Mr Hamilton: Despite the fact that they get helped out by Utah.

Mr S.G. EVANS: I notice that the member for Albert Park is in his place, but the member for Hartley is not—he will be told to return to his place in a minute. The local council has a major role to play in this area. The loss last year in providing public transport was $104 million. In many areas water and sewer mains are out of date and have reached the end of their economic life. We need to spend hundreds of millions of dollars to return them to the condition of our forefathers' time. In nearly every suburb our streets are falling to pieces. We need millions of dollars in that field. So whether or not we like it, we have to accept some closer development.

I know the old saying that that goes against the Australian tradition. In South Australia particularly we seem to believe in an individual home on an individual allotment. I would like that: I live on quite a big allotment comprising six hectares, but we have to accept closer development. I do not believe we can continue as at present. We are not catching up; we are falling behind the eight ball.

There are people in the upper age group who have worked all their lives, or have served in wars and have dedicated themselves to the tasks set for them. They have paid for or are close to paying for their own home, but they suddenly reach a stage of life where they thought they had enough money on which to live, or that the pension might carry them through. They think they will receive a concession on water rates if they are on the pension, but by the time they pay council, sewerage and water rates, and heating or cooling costs, that is out of the question. We have an opportunity to give those people a chance to be able to stay where their friends are, where their home is, where they want to be for the rest of their lives.

There is one other more delicate area, but I will speak to it, because I believe it is something that will eventuate and something that we will have to accept. Some people, male or female, live in large homes on their own. Even though they would be happy to have somebody share that accommodation with them, because of the present matrimonial laws in this country, particularly when a *de facto* relationship can be claimed at some later stage, they do not do so. The person moving into the accommodation may have nothing, but at a later stage they can claim a *de facto* relationship and thus half of that home. I believe that, if the power is not already there, we as a Parliament should consider legislation that will enable binding contracts to be entered into relating to the conditions under which a person makes their home available for sharing. It could be provided that consumer affairs, or some similar organisation, could look at the contract before signing to ensure that under the circumstances it is a reasonable contract.

Quite recently, an elderly gentleman approached me and said, 'Stan, I would be prepared to have somebody come and live in my home'. He said, 'I don't want a relationship with any woman—I am past that—but I would be fearful that, if somebody came to live in my home, sometime in the future they would make some allegation. Where do I stand? I cannot look after the place properly, including the garden, but I want to stay here until the end of my days. Why can I not be guaranteed that my assets will be protected and that, if any circumstances arise where people want to move on at some stage, they move on?'

To mention contractual arrangements enters a delicate arena, but it is already happening in the area of marriage. The legal eagles may be able to tell me that we can do it now, but we need to be sure that the individual is protected. Many people are genuinely interested, but they are scared, because nowadays everybody sues for every cent and tends to make money out of it, as do the lawyers.

Mr Groom interjecting:

Mr S.G. EVANS: I heard an interjection from a legal eagle, but I missed it. I probably missed the greatest opportunity of my parliamentary career, so I will have to forget about it. I am concerned about the growing numbers on the Housing Trust waiting list. The present Government, as have other governments, has attempted to pick up the backlog, but when building allotments range in price from $20 000 to $60 000, and the price of homes without land starts at $33 000 to $34 000, it is fairly difficult for people to purchase homes. I will not enter the dogfight relating to interest rates, but it is especially difficult when we have no guarantees, because of what may happen here or elsewhere in the world, of what the interest rate will be tomorrow. We do not know whether interest rates have reached their highest level. It may be that in five or 10 years time interest rates will climb even higher, as has been the case in America and other places.

When that situation prevails, the numbers on that waiting list will not be decreased substantially and more and more people will be dependent upon the State. We have to begin making use of the accommodation that is already there. To some people my suggestions may seem radical, but people know that I am a fairly practical person and I believe that Parliament should look at it in a fairly practical way.

Mr Groom: What's the local member up there doing to assist?

Mr S.G. EVANS: It depends upon which member the honourable member is referring to. If he is talking about up in the Mitcham Hills area, the local member would be thrilled if the Government found some money to help provide accommodation in that community in the form of senior citizens or elderly citizens villages. Rates and taxes and Government charges are becoming so high that many people cannot afford to stay in their homes. I raise the point because those people have raised the issue with me. If they have to leave their family home, there is nowhere else in the Mitcham Hills or Stirling area for them to go.

They have to come to the plains, a totally different environment to them; different climatic conditions, and none of their friends are there. The whole lifestyle has to change. I do not think any of us accept that as a reasonable proposition, and I am suggesting a way of government's avoiding having to find a lot of cash quickly, and in the long term, I believe, saving money for the taxpayers. So I finish on this note. I was worried about the budget the Government has brought in, as I believe all concerned citizens in South Australia are, not just because of this budget but because we as a country—individuals, businesses, local government, State Government, Federal Government—are not using our own money in our own country; we are using millions and millions borrowed from other lands, and we are controlled by them now.

We no longer really own our own country, whether we like it or not. Do not worry about the Americans. It is not the 'Yanks' who will own us now. We can see what is happening to industries and land throughout the country, who is buying it, and where the money is coming from that is brought in here for us to borrow. For every dollar that

we borrow at the moment in the federal field, 64 cents goes to pay the interest on previous borrowings. Next year it will be 67 cents. It is always going up, until we are so far in debt that we are borrowing money to pay the interest and paying nothing off the capital. Whether we like it or not, we have become a society that is living beyond its means—Governments, the private sector and many companies also—and we are the working agents of moneylenders, the slaves of interest rates. It is time we started to accept that that is a fact. I leave my comments at that.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Goyder.

Mr MEIER (Goyder): I am pleased to have the opportunity to speak on this motion this evening, and in particular to look in general terms at some of the things that came up in the Estimates Committees, but more particularly at some of the things that have derived from the budget. I think we have seen that the budget has been typically a bankcard budget, as our Leader described it earlier on. It is a budget that has in many ways been deceitful. I have brought to the attention of this House before some of the deceit we see. We had the $90 million Jubilee program for maintenance of schools and associated facilities, but when we look into it closely it is not $90 million new dollars, it is $90 million that would have been provided anyway; in fact, I believe the figures indicated a 5 per cent cut overall.

Mr Groom: Tell us about your 1982 budget. That was a most deceitful budget.

Mr MEIER: It is interesting to hear the member for Hartley say 'Tell us about the 1982 budget.' Members opposite want to look to the past all the time. They are too scared to look to the future. It is obvious from some of the press releases coming out now that they are running scared, and rightly so. They do not know when they are going to have an election: they know that if they go now it is defeat, and they say, 'Let's hang on a bit longer, and hopefully things will improve.' If we look at the economy and how things are going, things will not improve. The public is sick and tired of the Government's broken promises, its 188 broken tax promises, or charges promises.

Members interjecting:

Mr MEIER: Time is limited, so I will not direct my comments to some of the interjections. Perhaps the biggest thing was that after the budget had been brought down the Premier realised the public had not bought it, so his Cabinet (and I guess some of the backbenchers who are interjecting) said, 'You have to do something more. Even though you said it was to be a balanced budget and we found the Auditor-General recognised that there was a $50 million deficit—'

Mr Groom: Oh, don't talk—

Mr MEIR: The honourable member criticises the Auditor-General; that is his prerogative, but I will accept the Auditor-General's views. We see that the Premier decides in his haste to give $3 million to a select group, particularly a group that might be in marginal seats. I do not know whether the marginal seats are in Unley so much, but they certainly are in the southern suburbs and the north-eastern suburbs. It is very interesting to see how one of our local journalists, Des Colquhoun, regarded the Premier's announcement in his column on 2 October, the day after the Premier had announced the $3 million vote buying program. Des Colquhoun, under the heading, 'Having our interests at heart', says:

"It's our duty," said the Premier, Mr Bannon, "to protect the voters from rising interest rates."

"Er." said the Treasurer, "Mr Bannon don't you mean 'protect the citizens?' "

"Oh, yes quite," said the Premier. 'Slip of the tongue. However, we can't have young home owners thrown into debt by high interest rates."

"Right," said the Treasurer. "The SA way of life is built on home ownership. The home is our heartland. And if people can't afford to pay of their houses the building industry will suffer and thousands will be out of work."

"Oh, we can't have that," said the Premier. "Perhaps the Government could help pay people's housing loans." "Goodness", said the Treasurer. "Where would we get the money?"

"From the taxes we collect from the home owners," said the Premier.

"It'd cost billions," said the Treasurer, turning pale.

"Then we'll only do it for some," said the Premier.

"But is that fair?" said the Treasurer.

"It is at election time," said the Premier.

"Okay," said the Treasurer. "I'll earmark $3m out of tax revenue for a start."

"Then," said the Premier, "there are all those voters—er, citizens—complaining about the high interest rates on their video recorders."

"Goodness," said the Treasurer, "we can't have people not buying videos. It would throw hundreds out of work."

"Quite," said the Premier. "Besides, telly keeps their minds off their struggle to make ends meet."

"So, we'll subsidise their interest payments?" said the Treasurer.

"Just some of them," said the Premier.

"And I'll take the money from tax revenue?" said the Treasurer.

"Yes," said the Premier, and the Treasurer made a note of it. "And while you're about it, grab a few million to help pay the interest on car loans, will you?"

"Clever, that," said the Treasurer, doing a quick calculation. "But we can't afford to do it for everyone. I'll restrict it to, say, the southern and north-east suburbs."

"Quite," said the Premier. "That's where the dodgy seats are. Then earmark some more revenue to help those struggling to pay off boats and washing machines."

"Right," said the Treasurer. "Must look after the family."

That is a very good summary of the absolutely despicable way this Government is going about buying votes. It is blantant vote buying. It has never been seen in South Australia before, but this Labor Government is desperate and will do anything to get back in there.

It realises it cannot afford to make too many extravagant promises, so now it just gives money, money, money away, and we heard the Leader of the Opposition yesterday say that it appears there could be up to $200 million that has been promised or will be spent in the future simply to buy votes: $200 million. It is a tragedy for this State, and I hope—I know—that people will see through this deception by the Government and throw it out of office. Let us hope it stays out of office for as long as I am around.

With this $3 million that has been given to subsidising some select sections in the housing industry, whether they live in Springfield or wherever, I would like to suggest areas on which the money could have been spent—not necessarily in the swinging electorates, but electorates such as Goyder I will give some examples. First of all, I had the pleasure, back in March 1983, of leading a deputation to the Minister of Water Resources, one of the lucky Ministers who still kept his portfolio (but I would say that after today's fiasco he will not have that portfolio for much longer).

I had the pleasure of leading a deputation from the Moorowie area, which wants reticulated water. That deputation consisted of four people and myself. The Minister gave a sympathetic hearing—I acknowledge that—but that was as

far as it went. He then sent a letter and said that, if we wanted water to boost the agricultural potential of the area and to allow people to have reticulated tap water, it would cost $594 000—a small sum relative to the $3 million that this Premier has just given away or relative to the $200 million that he is going to give away. It was $594 000 for a scheme that would have considerably increased the productivity of southern Yorke Peninsula and would have reproduced in terms of millions of dollars over the coming years.

However, the Minister said that, if we wanted to have the $594 000 scheme, each of the property owners would have to pay $12 000 towards it. What person can afford that for a start? If one was living in the city, one could imagine the hue and cry, and it is no different in the country. If one takes note of the farmers' marches, one would know that many farmers are finding the going tough and rough. That was one scheme on which a small section of the $3 million give away could have been spent.

We can note the Virginia area where planning some years ago left an area between King Road and Old Port Wakefield Road out of the reticulated water scheme. I took up that issue with the Minister on 19 February this year. The Minister's replied that for $62 175 the 16 property owners could have reticulated water. Again, it would mean a massive increase in their potential productivity and certainly in the land value of the Virginia area. However, if they wanted the $62 175 scheme, the owners would have to pay $3 885 each. So much for any give-away by the Government! It is not interested in seeing the productivity in this State increase. It is interested in buying votes in marginal seats.

As the Minister is in the House, I refer also to metered water hydrants. I am getting sick and tired of bringing up this matter with the Minister and watching things go from bad to worse. Originally it was proposed that 25 millimetre metered water hydrants were to come in on 1 July this year. Due to pressure from not only the Local Government Association but also members on this side and me, the Minister said that it would be delayed until 1 January 1986. I give him credit for that. He also acknowledged that some of the rental rates had to be modified or eliminated, and I give him credit for that also. The key factor for all country councils has been to reduce the amount of water coming out of a pipe by half or more if one takes the volume of pressure into account. However, the Minister will not budge. I am disturbed, because I wrote to the Minister on 27 February this year.

Mr Mathwin: Did you get an answer?

Mr MEIER: I have not received an answer. I wrote again on 30 July and reminded the Minister that I had not received an answer. I received acknowledgedment on 31 July—the day after—to say that my second letter had been received, that the Minister was away at the time and that the letter would be referred to him as soon as possible.

It is now 9 October, and I still have not had an answer from the Minister since 27 February. I am prepared to accept up to three months delay because I know that many Ministers take that long, but it is going to extremes when one has to wait this long. The Minister needs to be aware that a change from 50 millimetre water hydrants to 25 mm water hydrants would mean, on tests that I have had conducted, a massive increase in cost for roadmaking in councils. In fact, as one person who conducted the tests said to me, he could reasonably expect to run at present eight loads of water per day on a major road construction project. However, under the proposed system he could expect to run not eight loads but two loads of water. One can imagine the costs on water and labour prices which, on my figures, will amount to a 459 per cent increase. Yet, the Minister is saying that at this stage he is not prepared to allow the 25 mm water hydrants to come in.

It is interesting to note that the Chairman of the Local Government Association, Mr Des Ross, has also taken issue with this and is not at all happy with the Minister's reply. In fact, I have read extracts of that letter into *Hansard* on a previous occasion. As the Minister is in the House, I urge him to reconsider this matter, as I believe that he knows in his heart that it should not be changed: it should remain as it is, or at least the councils should have the right to have 50 mm water hydrants. Most, if not all, councils in Goyder would need that right, but because of the way in which it is worded at present it seems almost impossible for councils to have that right.

While we are talking about delays in answering letters, I refer also to a letter that I wrote to the then Chief Secretary on 30 April this year concerning proposed new regulations for the licensing of firearms and how those regulations might affect people who belonged to pistol clubs. The then Minister was the Hon. Jack Wright. On 21 August I wrote again, not having received a reply, and we now have a new Minister, the Hon. Don Hopgood. Again, it is getting close to two months since my reminder letter, and I have now drafted another letter which, hopefully, will go out tomorrow.

Since April, a good five months have elapsed, but still no reply has been received. That seems to be how this Government is conducting its affairs currently. It is not good enough and shows that the Government is running scared. It does not even know how to run its departments. The sooner the election comes, so that the people can change this Government, the better it will be.

The other issue that the Government has been mucking up is that of the licence plate system. I could read another magnificent extract from a Des Colquhoun column, but time does not allow me to do so. A constituent of mine owns a 1966 Austin truck which was registered until 29 September this year. My constituent found that he had lost the registration papers. He telephoned the Registrar of Motor Vehicles and asked to be sent some new registration papers as he had misplaced the old ones. The spokesperson from the office said that it would take two weeks to get them out. He said that that was all right as he would not be using the truck for two weeks. However, over the weekend he found the registration papers and, rather than take them down on Monday 30 September (he could not get down to Adelaide as he lives at Mallala), my constituent decided that, as a neighbour was going down on Tuesday 1 October, he would ask him to take the registration down.

The neighbour took the papers down to the Registrar of Motor Vehicles at Adelaide and said, 'Here is the money for the reregistration of this truck.' He or she was told, 'But that truck has the registration number 471-292, that has all figures and you are one day late in paying your registration; therefore we will take your number plate.' The people had no recourse. They said, 'But hang on, this has been registered for years and years.'

The Hon. D.C. Brown: Hasn't the Minister fixed that yet?

Mr MEIER: I have not approached the Minister. I have been trying to get on to the Registrar all day. But, as the member for Davenport said, 'Hasn't the Minister fixed that?' I ask why do members of Parliament have to be contacted about these things? Surely the Registrar of Motor Vehicles knows what is happening. However, my constituent was made to pay $6 for a new set of number plates. That was not what was upsetting him as much as the principle. He was not told when he rang and said that he had lost his registration papers that if he did not have them in on time, he would lose his number plate.

It is a disgrace that this sort of thing is happening. It is happening not only to my constituents. I have heard it on talk back radio and I have seen it in the papers, and,

according to my constituent (whose name by the way is Mr Les Earle of Mallala) a person who was next in line at the counter also had a similar situation where a number plate was unceremoniously grabbed from them. They could not have it anymore because they also were a day or two late. This Government is determined to stoop to any low form so that it can have the public where it wants them. It could not care less about the public's rights. Again it is high time that an election was held.

The last point that I would like to make concerns one other area in which this Government could have spent the $3 million better. I have taken it up with the appropriate Minister and correspondence will be leaving my office shortly. It concerns the electricity tariffs for the Maitland Retirement Village and many other villages like it throughout the State. Currently the Maitland Retirement Village pays for electricity on the F rate which is the highest rate. They believe that they should have the right to pay at the M rate.

They also have a lot of pensioners there who would be eligible for the $50 rebate and believe that consideration should be given to giving the retirement village that $50 rebate. I am taking up that matter with the Minister at present. If that was instituted for Maitland, it would be a saving of over $3 000—not a large amount, but still a significant amount for a concern that is presently running on a budget deficit of $11 000 per annum. They have tried to cut back staff; they have altered staff working hours and have tried to cut down wherever they can on costs.

I have tonight highlighted a few examples in the short time available to me where this Government, if it wanted to throw away $3 million, could have spent it much more intelligently and usefully. The results would have helped South Australia rather than the Government having blatantly bought votes. The public will not be deceived. They will have their vote shortly, and it will be very pleasing to see some few members of the present Government on this side of the Chamber.

The Hon. D.C. BROWN (Davenport): I point out to the honourable member who has just resumed his seat that some after the election from the other side might not be here at all. I wish to take up the issue revealed in the Estimates Committee that this State has lost 14 000 jobs in the manufacturing sector in the last three years. I ask members of the House to reflect on the fact that this loss of 14 000 manufacturing jobs has occurred at a time when we have had so-called economic growth, particularly in the manufacturing sector, and a so-called economic recovery.

This raises some very interesting questions that this State and the Government of this State need to tackle in terms of what is occurring in the manufacturing sector, what is the long-term future of it in relation to whether we are undergoing what could only be described as almost a revolution in terms of changes, particularly employment changes, within the manufacturing industry. Those 14 000 jobs means the loss of well over 10 per cent of this State's manufacturing employment.

Manufacturing is our biggest single industrial sector employing previously about 18 to 19 per cent of our work force. Of course, it is one of the major initiators in terms of production within our economy in this State. It is not our biggest exporter in national terms, but it is certainly a major exporter in terms of export to other States of Australia. It has been traditionally accepted that South Australia is a manufacturing State with a manufacturing base that was very secure, although it was very heavily dependent on metals pressing, the car industry and the white goods industry.

For this State to have lost somewhere between 10 per cent and 14 per cent of its manufacturing work force in that three year period, and for it to have occurred during a period of so-called economic growth and recovery, raises very serious questions about the change in structure of our employment and changes that are occurring because of technological change.

I put those points to the Minister of Technology and the gentleman who also purports to be the Minister of Employment in this State. I was somewhat disturbed that I felt the Government, and in particular the Minister's department and the Minister, had failed to come to grips with the magnitude of the change that was occurring. Yesterday, I went to a seminar on technological change sponsored by the Metal Industries Association, with employers, employees and trade union officials speaking. It was interesting to hear the theme coming through from most of the speakers.

Incidentally, the Minister opened that seminar and stayed as long as he could. I appreciate the fact that Ministers cannot stay for entire seminars. It would have been interesting for the Minister to have stayed and heard the points made by subsequent speakers. I thought the point came through very loudly and clearly that so far governments in Australia have failed to come to grips with what is needed by private industry in the manufacturing sector to tackle on a competitive basis the challenges that they face in the future. If that is not occurring now, and if they are not responding during a period of economic growth, then what is the long term outlook for our manufacturing base? More importantly, what is the outlook for the 100 000 or so jobs involved in the manufacturing industry in South Australia?

I am not for one moment trying to suggest that all those jobs and all our manufacturing companies will be lost. However, a very serious erosion of our manufacturing base is occurring and I believe that it is a serious enough erosion that this State should take up what is almost an alarming situation and implement an appropriate program, first, to arrest that loss of jobs and, secondly, to turn it around and start to develop again with a growing base.

It is quite obvious that the biggest loss has been in the area of metals fabrication. It is particularly disturbing to see that the base companies that produce the raw materials, or the base products for further machinery in this State have found such a difficult period. I refer particularly to the foundries within this State. It is interesting to see that something like six or seven of the major foundries within this State have shut during the last three years. A foundry is the real core of metals machining industry, because, unless you have the foundry technology and the expertise and skills to produce the metal form, there is little hope of taking it the subsequent steps and machining it down to the appropriate end product, which is invariably in this State components for the motor vehicle industry.

It was very grim news for this State when it was announced, two or three weeks ago, that Mason and Cox was to go into receivership. It is probably one of the most highly respected foundry businesses in this State and certainly one with the best equipment, technology and skills in its workforce. I have a very high regard for the management of that company; I knew its officers on a personal basis, and I have been through the plant at least twice. It is disturbing to see companies like that going into receivership, with the consequent flow on effects from that which will be evident in the years ahead.

This is also occurring in the fabrication area, where some of the biggest companies have reduced their workforce to a fraction of what they were three years ago. It means that those companies have lost many of their skilled welders, particularly X-ray welders, the people which any company need on a substantial basis and needs them very quickly in

relation to taking up large orders. It is fine to talk about the chances of South Australia's getting the submarine contract and to put up a massive PR and marketing exercise on that matter directly aimed at boosting our morale and chances of getting the contract (of which I am a strong supporter) but at the same time we cannot afford to have the base industries which would be supplying companies involved with the manufacture of submarines disappearing from this State or losing their trade skills, yet that is exactly what has occurred.

The State Government has not been sufficiently astute in appreciating what is really needed in relation to winning that contract for South Australia. The competing States, like Victoria, and to a lesser extent New South Wales, have been more sophisticated in their approach to getting that submarine contract. They have understood that the prime issue is to have the trade skills and then the trade quality control needed to produce defence equipment. Anyone engaged in the manufacture of defence equipment will say that quality control is the biggest single cost item and that it is the most important factor in winning contracts. This is not public knowledge, but I was fascinated to learn that the Victorian Government has established a $10 million program to ensure quality control and to build up a program leading to the potential achievement of getting the submarine contract.

South Australia has not done that. It has not implemented any proposal of that sort of proportion, and as a result I think we will face enormous difficulties in the future. Another issue that comes out of this change that has occurred in our manufacturing workforce is the emphasis (including the enormous resources involved) of successive Governments on assisting the unemployed and the lack of emphasis that is put on assisting people with education and training so that they do not remain unemployed to start with. Frankly, if we put the same resources into making sure that our young people do not become unemployed as we have put into programs such as the Community Employment Program (involving literally hundreds of millions of dollars in this State), we would find that we would not have the unemployment problems that exist today. Unemployment would not be anywhere near the level that it is at the moment, and at the same time we would now have a much more highly skilled workforce which would be capable of successfuly challenging for projects such as the submarine project. That message came through loudly and clearly from the speakers at the seminar yesterday, namely, that this State needs to put far greater emphasis on and direct many more resources into training our young people so that the necessary trade skills are available.

I want to highlight some of the trends that are occurring. There will be a very significant drop in apprenticeship intakes this year—a drop of some 25 per cent. Further, there is still no degree course in manufacturing engineering in South Australia. There is a shortage of student positions within the engineering faculty at Adelaide University. There is a lack of CADCAM facilities at Adelaide University for training our young engineers in the latest technology. I stress that point, because yesterday speaker after speaker also addressed that point, stating that if we are to be able to compete on an international (or even a national) basis we must be flexible and be very quick in our response to demands that are created in the marketplace. Without CADCAM facilities there is little flexibility, and certainly no rapid response can be made.

There is no great commitment within our manufacturing industry to new technology and new methods of production. There is still too much Government interference by means of regulations and restrictions on manufacturing industry. I invite any member of the House to think through some of the impositions that this Parliament has introduced through legislation on manufacturing companies over the years. We require companies to do this and that and to rigidly stick to rules in a whole range of areas. Having been Minister of Industrial Affairs, I know the extent of these rules that we impose from numerous departments, from the Department of Consumer Affairs to the Department of Labour, the Department of Health and others. They redirect energy into simply administering the bureaucratic demands made on them, instead of getting on and becoming competitive. We need to redirect our manufacturing industry and to renovate it.

While a number of good initiatives have been started by the Federal Government in trying to establish high technology industry, it would be wrong of any Government to believe that sunrise industries or new industrial high technology companies are going to be our salvation: they will not be. Barry Jones, the Federal Minister for Technology has been misguided on that point for many years. He believes that these high technology sunrise industries will suddenly come over the horizon and solve all our problems in manufacturing industry. The evidence is that that will not be the case. Our financial, human and physical resources are locked up in existing companies. It is those companies which must take on the new technology, both in the products that they are producing and in the way that they are produced. We need a new direction in terms of an emphasis on better design and quality control of our products. We need far more emphasis placed on research and development—and I stress the development aspect—in our private companies in the manufacturing sector.

It is interesting to note that far less than 1 per cent of GDP goes into research and development; far less than 1 per cent of the total sales of companies in Australia goes into research and development. In fact, it has been estimated that about half the research and development effort by private companies in Australia is simply for payment to overseas parent companies or payment to overseas companies for patents and other research and development which is imported by those companies—in other words for work done outside Australia—and this has absolutely no benefit for South Australia.

Frankly, we need a new strategy drawn up by the State Government, showing an appreciation of the immediate problems, the on-hand problems being faced by our manufacturing sector. We must ensure that there is a role for engineering technicians and tradesmen in our manufacturing industry. In recent years there has been a disturbing trend where accountants have taken over manufacturing industry, and in taking over that industry they have placed a great deal of emphasis on the maximum use of capital resources, without necessarily keeping up to date in terms of the technology, physical efficiency and quality of production.

I am not saying that the rationalisation and the improved use of capital resources achieved by the accountants has been a bad thing. In fact, I have come to the conclusion that many of the accountants have shaken up the sloppy financial side of our manufacturing industry, and that needed to be shaken up. But the accountants need to realise (particularly those accountants, financiers and speculators whose policies have led to a very significant amalgamation, consolidation and, it is fair to say, rationalisation of our manufacturing sector on a national basis) that it is time to allow the technocrats and engineers to come back in and have a dominant say in what is produced and how it is produced.

If we do not do that in Australia, the erosion of our manufacturing base will occur at an alarming rate, as we have seen in the last three years. My first point in relation to the Estimates Committee concerns the on-line computer in the Motor Registration Division. We have just heard from the member for Goyder about the sorts of inefficencies

and bureaucracies in that department and how it took away a number plate from one of his constituents.

Early in 1982, the then Liberal Government gave approval to that department to purchase computer equipment to computerise the registration of motor vehicles and drivers licences within South Australia. During the Estimates Committees I asked how that purchase was going, only to find out—because we have had promise after promise—that after four years following the initial approval it has just reached the stage of issuing tenders for that equipment. It will be the end of 1987 before that system is fully operational, if no further delays occur, and I have a great suspicion that they will.

I also asked the Minister what savings would accrue to the State if that computerisation was implemented fairly quickly. I was told that the State would save 120 positions, which in salary terms works out at about $3.5 million a year, and that these people will be redeployed elsewhere within Government. By computerising that one section—the Motor Registration Division—we find that we can achieve savings of about $3.5 million. Yet, it will have taken more than six years for that computerisation to take place.

I understand that other States already have had a system up and running for several years. Their systems have been very cheap and nowhere near as complex or expensive as ours. In 1982 it was estimated that the purchase of that equipment and its operation would cost $3.3 million. It is now expected to be $4.5 million, largely as a result of inflation and proposed application and development of software. In that period, the cost of equipment alone has escalated by $1.2 million. That highlights the sort of waste that has occurred through indecision by this Government over the past three years.

I will not go into the details, but the Minister revealed the sort of saga of delay after delay, from one body across to another before decisions are made. For this Government to have taken three years to get to the point where tenders could be even called, let alone assessed and equipment purchased, is an absolute disgrace.

One other point I wish to raise relates to the proposed Interstate Road Transport Bill and the Interstate Road Transport Charge Bill, both of which have been introduced in Federal Parliament and passed by the House of Representatives but which are yet to be debated by the Senate. I raise this matter because it was the first point I mentioned in the Estimates Committee. I asked the Minister whether South Australia had agreed to provide legislation complementary to those two federal Bills, because it requires complementary legislation in this State, and whether or not this State has agreed in principle and has had negotiations with the Federal Government on that legislation.

I was disturbed to hear the Minister indicate that there had been considerable talks and basic agreement with the Federal Government on that legislation, which then causes us to fear what might occur when that legislation is passed federally and the complementary legislation is passed in South Australia. The legislation does a number of good things, but it also does a number of things which the transport industry fears greatly, as it has every right to do.

It reintroduces the concept of the ton-mile tax or what will be called the federal registration fee. Electronic charge monitoring devices, or technometers, will be installed in trucks to measure their mileage. From that our federal bureaucracy, with the support of the State bureaucracy, will be able to charge trucks so much for the use of roads on a ton-mile basis.

Based on the scale of fees already established, it is obvious that a very large semi-trailer in South Australia (a roadtrain) will cost about $7 900 to register under that legislation. A normal semi-trailer (a 37.5 tonne-plus truck) will cost about $1 380 in this State, with $40 extra for every quarter of a tonne over and above 37.5 tonnes.

Of course, most semi-trailers in South Australia carry at least 40 tonnes, so they will be well over $1 380. That legislation establishes the need for the licensing of transport businesses in South Australia, and it disturbs me that apparently this Government has seen fit to introduce a system which will require the licensing of all such businesses. We do not need that sort of trend within our Government ranks—increased bureaucracy at a time when the Government has paid so much lip service to the so-called cutting of red tape and reducing the size of the bureaucracy. We find that it is now out there actively participating, with its Federal colleagues in Canberra to build it up again.

During the Estimates Committees there was considerable discussion about the finances of the State Transport Authority and the cost of its operations this year. As a result of those discussions, I was given information with the approval of the Minister, and in particular I was given the recurrent operating statement for the State Transport Authority for 1985-86, the actual result for 1984-85 and the variation that is occurring. It is appropriate that I table that purely statistical information, so I seek leave to have it inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

STATE TRANSPORT AUTHORITY
RECURRENT OPERATING STATEMENTS

	1984/85 Actual $000	1985/86 Budget $000	Variation $000
Income			
Traffic receipts	28 445	29 271	+ 826
Roadliner	707	852	+ 145
S.A. Government reimbursement	19 130	19 848	+ 718
Property and advertising	1 501	2 005	+ 504
C & T (gross profit)	683	773	+ 90
Transit rights	2 463	2 106	− 357
Sundry receipts	893	271	− 622
Interest on investment	1 856	280	− 1 576
Total income	$55 678	$55 406	−$ 272
Expenses			
Traffic	45 881	47 805	+ 1 924
Maintenance	31 066	33 125	+ 2 059
General expenses	25 769	29 245	+ 3 476
Fuel and oil	10 509	12 314	+ 1 805
Depreciation	5 295	5 367	+ 72
Lease interest	4 767	6 150	+ 1 383
Amortization	3 404	4 620	+ 1 216
Loan interest	9 880	11 700	+ 1 820
Plus adjustments—accruals	2 631	2 138	− 493
Total expenses	$139 202	$152 464	+$13 262
Excess of Expenditure over Income (Net Cost of Providing Services)	$83 524	$97 058	+$13 534
Less Non-cash items			
—Accrual adjustment	2 631	2 138	− 493
—Depreciation	5 295	5 367	+ 72
—Amortization	3 404	4 620	+ 1 216
	72 194	84 933	+ 12 632
Plus Capital portion of leases	2 240	2 347	+ 107
Net cash required to provide services	$74 434	$87 280	+$12 739

The Hon. D.C. BROWN: I conclude by saying that I found that my level of dissatisfaction with the Estimates Committee operation in the transport area is higher than ever. I am unhappy with the way in which both the previous Minister and the new Minister handled that area. It astounds me that there seems to be a lack of ministerial control over the Department of Transport, the State Transport Authority

and the Highways Department. They are given no long-term ministerial leadership or direction.

As a result, the transport services of this State are floundering. We see results of that with increasing traffic congestion in the suburbs. Last Friday I was to attend the Estimates Committee at 9.30 a.m. I headed down Duthy Street shortly after 8.30 a.m. expecting to reach the city in plenty of time only to find—and this is the member for Unley's district—that the traffic was banked up along Duthy Street to Greenhill Road well past the new home units. After sitting in the traffic and hardly moving for about 10 minutes—

Mrs Appleby: Didn't you know there was a rally Friday morning?

The Hon. D.C. BROWN: Where was the rally?

Mrs Appleby: At Unley.

The Hon. D.C. BROWN: What rally was that? I would have thought it was a rally in favour of the Liberal Party's transport policy. Judging from the delays, I think I would have been embraced with joy by any one of the people in that queue. After a frustrating five minutes or so of sitting there in Duthy Street and hardly moving, I travelled down a residential street in an attempt to get through on Unley Road, only to find that the traffic was banked up from Greenhill Road, right down Unley Road, through the pedestrian lights and through the traffic lights, right back to the Coles shopping centre.

Mr Mayes: At 9.30?

The Hon. D.C. BROWN: At 9 a.m.

Mr Mayes: At 9 a.m.—it was 9.30 a minute ago.

The Hon. D.C. BROWN: No, I said that the Estimates Committee started at 9.30. The honourable member does not listen; he constantly gets his facts wrong. I point out that I was almost late for the Estimates Committee, because of the traffic congestion that existed and yet my colleagues opposite keep assuring me that there are no transport problems in Adelaide, that the traffic problems are minor and that there is no congestion or delay, but at 9 a.m. in the morning I found these incredible traffic delays along Duthy Street and Unley Road.

It is for that reason that I recently visited the member for Unley's electorate and discussed with the council and a number of small businesses the transport policies of the Liberal Party. I found that the business people in Unley, as well as the Unley council itself, have endorsed the north-south transport concept.

Mr Mayes: No, they haven't.

The Hon. D.C. BROWN: I saw the response.

Mr Mayes: No, they haven't.

The Hon. D.C. BROWN: Yes, they have. I saw the response from the member for Unley. He was almost paranoid in the local press. In fact, I understand that he is paranoid on any of these issues that are raised. It was very interesting to see the very favourable response that I received in relation to the Liberal Party's transport policies. I can now fully understand why.

The Hon. J.W. SLATER (Minister of Water Resources): I move:

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

Motion carried.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION: COMMONWEALTH FUNDING FOR HOUSING

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK (Light): I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: Last evening, when the debate was in progress relating to the current topic, at close to the end of my 30 minutes, when talking about Commonwealth funding for houses, it could be construed from the record in *Hansard* that I was referring to a 60 per cent maximum for Commonwealth funds for housing as from 1985-86. In actual fact, it is 60 per cent of the amount of money that is available for housing from the loan funds. The two matters were being discussed simultaneously. The method of expression could be misconstrued, and I seek to correct the record.

APPROPRIATION BILL

Debate on motion resumed.

Mr GUNN (Eyre): I am pleased to follow my colleague the member for Davenport, because I agree with his comments relating to morning travel along Duthy Street. I occasionally travel down that road and I have had great difficulty in arriving on time for my appointments in this place. If that is the basis of the Labor Party's transport policy, it will fall heavily.

Ms Lenehan interjecting:

Mr GUNN: The member for Mawson is worried about issues. Every time she travels around the country, she cannot help herself—she has to go to press. She has already committed the Labor Party to building the power line to Wilpena and she is now trying to get out of that. She can make as many statements as she likes, but the clerk and other people know the undertakings and that the vote catching exercise has backfired. In the few weeks that they have—

Members interjecting.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Eyre has the floor.

Mr GUNN: My electorate has many problems. It has been neglected by this Government. I received no assistance by way of replies in the Estimates Committees in which I was involved, but I was very disappointed about the uneconomic water schemes, which matter I drew to the attention of the Minister with some vigour. I was very disappointed that the Government appears not to have allocated any funds whatsoever towards those projects. I want to make another protest on behalf of my constituents that they are not only entitled to an adequate scheme, but those people who are suffering from drought conditions should not have to go through the rigmarole they are currently going through to get water carted west of Ceduna.

I was also disappointed that I did not have the opportunity to cross-examine the Minister of Housing and Construction. I attempted to ask the Deputy Premier a question about electorate offices and computer facilities and he told me that I should raise the matter with the Minister of Housing and Construction. After reading through the record I see that one of my colleagues raised the matter and he was told to bring it to the attention of the Deputy Premier. I am somewhat confused about this matter.

The Hon. T.H. Hemmings: You didn't read the answer correctly. I said a report was being prepared by the Public Service Board.

Mr GUNN: If that is the case, I will not continue with this topic: we will wait with bated breath and hope that something comes to fruition in the relatively near future. The other matter that caused me concern was the reply that I received from the Minister of Education relating to the serious lack of adequate space at the preschool in Leigh Creek. I again draw the Minister's attention to a letter I received on 13 May 1985 from the Northern Flinders Community Services Centre in which one of their recommen-

dations was the need for child-care for a large and seemingly growing group of preschool children. They said:

> There is a very obvious need for some form of child-care and adequate facilities to house them.

I endorse that and say to the Minister and to the Northern Flinders Community Services Centre that action should be taken immediately to begin rectifying the shortage of space at Leigh Creek in order that it may be ready for the 1986 school year.

The next matter of concern to me is the lack of an adequate supply of teachers, particularly in the technical area. Two schools in my electorate have approached me expressing concern that they are having great difficulty in attracting people who are able to teach technical studies. It would appear that there is a lack of people being trained each year and I therefore call on the Minister of Education to take whatever steps are necessary to ensure that there is an adequate supply of properly trained people so that they can be available to go to places such as Miltaburra, Leigh Creek, and those other important areas of the State that I have the pleasure to represent.

I want to say about the Committees that I found them to be a useful exercise. It is a pity there is not enough time in some ministries, when we consider, for example, the amount of money which the Minister of Education spends in a year, and the limited time members have to find information and to make comments upon the programs and the performance of the department.

Yesterday and the day before I had the opportunity of going north with the Public Works Standing Committee and I appreciated the opportunity. We looked at the police station at Marla Bore, an excellent complex, but a number of problems were pointed out to the committee. When I asked whether the committee was going to make a report on the experience of the people there, I was told that it was not able to do that.

It appears to me that there is an urgent need to amend the legislation under which the Public Works Standing Committee operates, so that it can look at programs during and after construction, and make comments and recommendations to the department concerned and to the Parliament. I think that is a matter of urgency. I believe that it is absolutely essential that at public hearings, where people have to sit and listen to public servants reading into the record reams of paper, that material be tabled or inserted in the record. It certainly would save a great deal of time and effort.

It is clear from our deliberations in the Estimates Committee that there is an urgent need for the Parliament to set up a statutory review authority, and I sincerely hope that that takes place in the relatively near future. I just want to say in conclusion that I am sorry that the Government has not seen its way clear to provide to those isolated communities facilities which people within the metropolitan area would take for granted—water, roads, electricity, adequate education facilities, and preschools. I know there are concerns in certain metropolitan electorates, but the problems of isolation are difficult to solve and it is a pity that there are not enough members of Parliament who fully appreciate and understand the needs of people in isolated communities.

I call on the Ministers and their departments to give favourable consideration to those matters I raised with them during the budget considerations. Of course, this will be the last occasion on which these Ministers will have the opportunity of presenting the details to the House, because soon, whenever the election is held, it is very clear that there will be a change of government.

I think that at least three people sitting on the Government back bench will not be here. The member for Brighton will be able to look at our map on the transport corridor she has been talking about. She will have plenty of time to examine that. I am not sure what the member for Unley will be able to do: go back to the Public Service, I suppose. The member for Mawson will rejoin the illustrious teaching profession.

Ms Lenehan: I wouldn't put money on that if I were you.

Mr GUNN: I think the honourable member will be lucky to survive. She will get caught up in that movement which is going to take place across this State as a number of people fall off the list. I well recall the former member for Elizabeth getting up here one afternoon and farewelling one or two of our colleagues. We all know what happened on that occasion, and who got farewelled.

Ms Lenehan interjecting:

Mr GUNN: I would not be too cheeky if I were the honourable member: she will be one of the first to get caught up in the swing when the ballot boxes are counted. We on this side of the House are quite confident of what the result will be. So, I say in conclusion that we are looking forward to having a Liberal Government present the next budget to the people of this State.

The SPEAKER: The honourable member for Glenelg.

Mr MATHWIN (Glenelg): I would first like to draw to the attention of the House a couple of matters which I feel are very important. One in particular, on which we had a certain amount of discussion already today, is in relation to the north-south corridor.

Ms Lenehan interjecting:

Mr MATHWIN: It is all very well for the member for Mawson to bleat about, 'Here we go again,' but it is her residents, her constituents, who will suffer most, trying to get from the south into the city. The honourable member should know, if she drives a car, as I believe she does, and if she talks to her residents, that they have a terrific problem getting into town and getting to work, whether they come down South Road or down Brighton Road, which has been choked up by the opening of the Lonsdale way into the city.

Ms Lenehan interjecting:

Mr MATHWIN: I would be glad to tell the honourable member. No doubt it was the member for Mawson who gave advice to the Labor candidate for Bright, who put out false information, and distributed it around the district, no doubt with the blessing of the member for Mawson. He produced a photostat copy of a paper that was put out with two very good photographs, one of the member for Mawson and one of the member for Glenelg. When he put that out in criticism of me he cut off the member for Mawson's photograph, and put out his propoganda in relation to what was going to happen with Morphett Road. It is no use the honourable member being coy about this. She would know very well what went on in that situation.

I do not want to be led off the track. The member for Ascot Park and his predecessor do not hold any records in relation to this problem in the north-south corridor. Indeed, it was his predecessor, the former Minister of Transport (Mr Virgo) who caused all the chaos now happening on Brighton Road. Indeed, from Brighton Road it has now flowed on to the Anzac Highway, where people are queued up from the K-Mart down to Keswick Bridge, and it take so much time—

Ms Lenehan: You don't even know—

Mr MATHWIN: Just hold your breath for 10 minutes and you will hear the good news. The Minister of Transport today talked to us for about three quarters of an hour, and said nothing. We were no wiser when he finished than we were when he got up. The former Minister (Mr Virgo), the previous Minister (Mr Abbott), and the present Minister of Transport feel that somehow this problem of traffic and

traffic flow, this congestion on South Road, Brighton Road, and on Anzac Highway, will disappear by means of some magic wand. Of course, in my view, and that of any normal thinking person, it will not disappear because it has to be solved. It will be solved by the north-south corridor.

That is a matter of fact, and it is the only way in which the problem will be solved. The Government has announced that there will be a massive increase in housing in the area of the member for Mawson—in the new areas of Reynella and Morphett Vale. We all know of the rapid development of Hallett Cove and Karrara.

Ms Lenehan interjecting:

Mr MATHWIN: The honourable member is on my deaf side—I can not pick up what she is saying. If the member for Mawson would like to write me a letter, I will answer it.

Ms Lenehan interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr MATHWIN: She is very naughty doing that to me, and I thank you for your protection, Mr Speaker. Honourable members would know that, with the announced building program at Seaford and in those areas of the south, the traffic will become much heavier than it is now. Some of us wonder whether that is at all possible. However, it will become much worse, so it is imperative that the Government do something about it instead of talking about it and hoping that, by some magic, it will disappear, because it will not. It is no good the member for Brighton saying that she has a map delineating where it will be but that that map is 15 or 19 years old. If that is the case, why is the member for Brighton informing those people and saying, 'Here is the alternative'?

Ms Lenehan interjecting:

Mr MATHWIN: It is the member's word against at least five or six people who attended a very excellent meeting at Seacombe Heights on Sunday morning. It is a pity that the honourable member did not turn up at that meeting, as she knew it was on. We would have made her quite welcome and would have given her the opportunity to say a few wise words to the people. I suggest that the honourable member would have needed my protection and, indeed that of the member for Davenport, from a lynching mob, because they were after her blood. A number of people at that meeting said that they had been to the office of the member for Brighton. Indeed, some of them said that they had met her at a close little gathering that she had had on the Saturday and that the honourable member had said to them, 'Right, we have got it fixed: this is where it will be'.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I think we are straying well away from the point of the debate. I ask the honourable member to return to relevant matters.

Mr MATHWIN: I was relating to the lines. We are dealing with budget expenditure and appropriation. Money ought to be allocated. If we want to use delay tactics, a study is instigated and, if we really mean business, a model is put out, which puts it off for 10 years. We have had failure by the previous Labor Government for 10 years when Mr Virgo said in 1972 that that Government would not do anything for 10 years as it was not going to get bad.

The Hon. Michael Wilson: And he told me in 1979 that, if he had been re-elected, he would have done the same for another 10 years.

Mr MATHWIN: That is right. Something has to crash in that situation with Mr Virgo. Either the 10 years runs out, or he does. I was interested to hear the remark from my colleague, friend and neighbour that they were the words of the wise Mr Virgo. He cannot keep on going like that, hoping that the situation will disappear, because it will not do so.

My constituents are suffering under the current situation. They have great problems in getting to and from work, and they complain all the time that there are bottlenecks everywhere. The member for Brighton shakes her head and says, 'No'. The honourable member no doubt comes in on the train. I suppose the member for Brighton gets on the train at Brighton or Hove and travels into Adelaide. She would not know what was happening on the roads. The only time that the honourable member is on the road is at times like this morning, when she was out at 7 o'clock putting little letters in letterboxes.

An honourable member: You mean 6 o'clock.

Mr MATHWIN: No, 7 o'clock.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I ask the honourable member to resume his seat. The activities of the member for Brighton, whether in her electorate or otherwise, are far removed from this debate. I ask the honourable gentleman to remember that. I also ask members on the other side of the House to refrain from interjecting and let the member for Glenelg continue in his own way.

Mr MATHWIN: I appreciate your protection, Mr Speaker. I refer again to there being insufficient funds for the north-south corridor. Great problems exist which upset most of my constituents and which certainly would concern the constituents of the members for Mawson and Brighton. I refer to heavy transport and getting those vehicles to and from the city. It is imperative that for them alone we have some corridor or way through other than South Road. Unless one is a complete idiot, one would not travel down South Road from Chryslers through Hindmarsh during peak periods.

Ms Lenehan interjecting:

Mr MATHWIN: The member for Mawson says, 'What are you talking about?' She is busy licking letters. She is upset about what has gone on today. She is upset about her colleague and friend, the member for Brighton.

Ms Lenehan: She's a big girl, and can—

Mr MATHWIN: I appreciate that, and hope that *Hansard* got it. It is one of the few times that I agree with the honourable member. The member for Brighton has been caused some trouble in relation to the information she gave these people.

Mrs Appleby interjecting:

Mr MATHWIN: The honourable member must have because, for anybody to get out of bed so early to deliver letters in that terrain, as one would have to be a mountain goat to get around there—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member knows that I have ruled such comments out of order. I ask him to come back to the topic.

Mr MATHWIN: I apologise for straying a little. I am trying to get over to the Government, particularly to the Minister sitting on the front bench, that something must happen in relation to the problem in the south. It is of grave concern to the people who have to travel daily backwards and forwards to the city, whether to work or play. It is still annoying if one is going out to play golf if one cannot get down the street and has to take an extra half an hour.

The other matter that I will deal with just briefly is that of sand replenishment. I approached the Minister for Environment and Planning in relation to the sand replenishment program which occurs at this time of each and every year and on which the Government of the day spends about $250 000. Maybe this year it would be a good idea, and indeed desirable, certainly for the people who live at Hallett Cove and the surrounding area, for some sand to be dumped in that area. It is a fairly rocky section, and a lot of people with young families live there.

Normally, sand moves from south to north, but the Hallett Cove Surf Lifesaving Club, which has been asked by both the previous Government and this Government to take readings of that movement (and has done so religiously) has proved that there is very little movement in the sand at Hallett Cove. It seems to be fairly constant in the Hallet Cove Bay and it is not lost. Therefore, it would have been fair for the Government to try the experiment of dumping sand there knowing full well that it would not disappear and that it would replenish the beach for a long period of time.

The Government carts most of its sand from the Port Stanvac area, and cartage to Hallett Cove, which is not far away, would be less expensive than from where they are carting it presently. However, the Minister in his wisdom or otherwise decided not to support that idea and has refused the approach. We now have a number of petitions in circulation with many hundreds of signatures requesting the Minister and the Government to change their minds on that issue. As I said, we are in the period of time when the program has started or is about to start, and I hope that the Minister, Caucus and certainly Cabinet, when they discuss it as they normally do, I presume, will rethink this situation and allow more sand to be placed on Hallett Cove beach.

Mr Ingerson: What is the problem?

Mr MATHWIN: It is a big problem and it is worrying a lot of people there. It certainly worries me as the future member for Bright. When that happens—and it will not be very long before it does—the full responsibility will be on me to try to get something fixed up. I am quite sure that my Government—

Ms Lenehan: You won't be here.

Mr MATHWIN: I do not want other members to get really upset. They know it is true.

An honourable member: John is right for Brighton.

Mr MATHWIN: Yes, and it rolls off the tongue: John is right for Bright. In fact, everybody is saying it down the south. Even the member for Mawson, who opened a kindergarten on Saturday, would realise that. Even people there were talking about 'John's right for Bright'.

Ms Lenehan: Where was this?

Mr MATHWIN: At the kindergarten that you opened so well on Saturday or Sunday.

Ms Lenehan interjecting:

Mr MATHWIN: Well, the honourable member was talking to my daughter and—

The SPEAKER: Order! I hope that the honourable member can take note that I have asked him twice to refrain for these parochial and private discussions that seem to have been taking place in large order in the southern suburbs.

Mr MATHWIN: Thank you, Mr Speaker. I think that I have supplied enough material for the Government to consider having some second thoughts in relation to that transport corridor and the sand replenishment program, which will assist the residents and the tourists at Hallett Cove. I support the Bill.

Mrs APPLEBY (Brighton): I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

The SPEAKER: There is a difficulty here, in that such leave would not be normally given until the end of the day, or at least until the end of a particular item of business. I think I will follow that course and call the honourable member later.

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

PERSONAL EXPLANATION: MEMBER'S REMARKS

Mrs APPLEBY (Brighton): I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

Mrs APPLEBY: I would like to place sufficiently on record that the member for Glenelg misrepresented the timing at which my letter boxing was done this morning. It was 6 a.m., not 7 a.m.

ADJOURNMENT

At 10.8 p.m. the House adjourned until Thursday 10 October at 2 p.m.