

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday 11 August 1987

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

PETITIONS: ELECTRONIC GAMING DEVICES

Petitions signed by 110 residents of South Australia praying that the House reject any measures to legalise the use of electronic gaming devices were presented by Messrs Abbott, Becker, and Lewis.

Petitions received.

PETITION: MILK PRICING

A petition signed by five residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Government to maintain the existing pricing arrangement for milk in the metropolitan area was presented by Mr Becker.

Petition received.

PETITION: TAFE LECTURERS

A petition signed by 146 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Government not to withdraw funds from TAFE and to maintain the present level and classification of lecturers was presented by Mr Becker.

Petition received.

PETITION: PRISON SENTENCES

A petition signed by 3 315 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Government to abolish parole and remissions of sentences for persons convicted of an armed hold-up offence was presented by Mr Becker.

Petition received.

PETITION: CARRICK HILL LAND

A petition signed by 60 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Government not to proceed with the subdivision of Carrick Hill land was presented by Mr S.G. Evans.

Petition received.

PETITION: KINDERGARTENS

A petition signed by 145 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Government to allocate sufficient funds to enable children to attend kindergartens for more than 12 months where necessary was presented by Mr Lewis.

Petition received.

PETITION: UNPASTEURISED MILK

A petition signed by 103 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Government to continue

to permit the retailing of unpasteurised milk was presented by Mr Wotton.

Petition received.

PETITION: STA BUS ROUTES

A petition signed by 61 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Government to retain State Transport Authority bus routes 193 and 194 was presented by Mr Wotton.

Petition received.

PETITION: BRIDGEWATER TRAIN SERVICE

A petition signed by 170 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Government to upgrade the Bridgewater train service was presented by Mr Wotton.

Petition received.

QUESTIONS

The **SPEAKER**: I direct that written answers to the following questions on the Notice Paper, as detailed in the schedule that I now table, be distributed and printed in *Hansard*, Nos 15 to 17.

PAPERS TABLED

The following papers were laid on the table:

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

Planning Act 1982—Crown Development Report on—Gepps Cross Hockey/Lacrosse Stadium.

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

River Murray Commission—Report, 1985-86.

By the Minister of Employment and Further Education (Hon. Lynn Arnold):

Roseworthy Agricultural College Statutes.

Technical and Further Education Act 1976—Regulations—Principals' Leave and Hours.

By the Minister of Transport (Hon. G.F. Keneally):

Corporation of Mount Gambier—By-law No. 7—Bees. Random Breath Testing Operation and Effectiveness—Report, 1986.

By the Minister of Education (Hon. G.J. Crafter):

Land Agents, Brokers and Valuers Act 1973—Regulations—Sale of Small Business Exemptions.

Rules of Court—Local and District Criminal Courts Act 1926—Local Court—Commercial Arbitration Applications.

By the Minister of Labour (Hon. Frank Blevins):

Workers Rehabilitation and Compensation Act 1986—Regulations—Claims and Registration.

By the Minister of Fisheries (Hon. M.K. Mayes):

Fisheries Act 1982—Regulations—General Fishery—Fees.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: BELAIR-BRIDGEWATER RAIL SERVICE

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

Leave granted.

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: During Question Time on Thursday 6 August 1987, when replying to a question from the Deputy Leader, I referred to a meeting held on 28 November 1984 at which the members for Heysen and Davenport were present and from which meeting came recommendations to remove and replace the Belair-Bridgewater rail service, in part by bus services. Despite very strong protestations of innocence by the members for Heysen and Davenport, the media, to the best of my knowledge, did not report my comments.

The Hon. D.C. Wotton interjecting:

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: To the best of my knowledge. Therefore, I was surprised to be informed that, at a small protest meeting in front of the STA building on Friday afternoon of 7 August 1987 these members accused me of telling lies to the Parliament. Furthermore, I am informed that the member for Davenport challenged the press to report him as saying that I lied to the House. In addition, I am informed that both members were going to demand an apology during today's sittings. It was fortunate for the member for Davenport that his challenge was not taken up.

Two matters need to be addressed. First, what did I say on Thursday? I invite members to read the *Hansard* record.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: I call honourable members to order.

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: It is clear that I merely drew to the attention of the House that certain MPs had attended a meeting on 28 November 1984 from which the recommendations mentioned came. I take it that, because of the charge of lying, they deny they were present at that meeting. Secondly, because of the way the members reacted, I decided to personally look at the information available to me. I did this over the weekend, and I am now in a position to give additional details to the House.

There was a meeting at Stirling on 28 November 1984 of the Stirling Hills Public Transport Review Liaison Group. Amongst the 30 people recorded as being present were David Wotton, Stan Evans, Dean Brown and Lance Milne. The meeting was convened to receive and discuss a report from the review working group. This report included recommendations which had been developed after extensive study and consultation with all interested parties, including the local community, unions, politicians and local government. I am advised that the member for Davenport was an *ex officio* member of the working group.

The recommendations of the working group were presented under two categories—those that the working group were generally in agreement and those that warranted further discussion. It was generally agreed that there should be some rationalisation of the Belair-Bridgewater rail service due to its duplication of other services. It was recommended that further discussion was warranted on the future of the train service and two options were presented to the liaison group meeting as follows:

Option 1—Replace Adelaide-Belair-Bridgewater train service with a Belair-Bridgewater shuttle train service.

Option 2—Replace Belair-Bridgewater train service with a weekdays Blackwood-Stirling bus service (via Upper Sturt Road).

A report of the meeting provided to the Chairman of the STA and subsequently to the Minister does not record any objections to the closure of the Belair-Bridgewater service.

The Hon. D.C. Wotton interjecting:

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: Was the member for Heysen there? However, Mr Evans is recorded as opposing the elimination of the Bradbury bus service and Mr Brown is

recorded as stating that a bus along Upper Sturt Road would alleviate problems of students living in Upper Sturt who attend Heathfield High School. Mr Milne, as always the thinker, wanted to know if there was anything to learn from the provision of transport to little mountain villages in Austria and Switzerland.

The consensus view that came from the meeting was that the train service should be discontinued and replaced, in part, by a low frequency bus service between Blackwood interchange and Stirling, further supplemented by route changes to STA services between Stirling and Aldgate. This recommendation was referred to the Minister of Transport, who subsequently advised the Chairman of the STA that he did not accept the recommendation to close the Belair-Bridgewater service.

On 4 June 1986, Mr Heath, Chief Traffic Manager of the STA, who was also the Chairperson of the Stirling Hills Transport Review, wrote to all members of the Liaison Committee advising of the recommendations put to the Minister and his refusal of them. The members for Heysen and Davenport have, I believe, demanded that I apologise to them for my statements made in the House last Thursday. I leave it to all members to decide to whom and by whom an apology is warranted.

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE REPORTS

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

Mount Gambier Woodroom.

Dry Creek Trunk Sewer Duplication (Stage II).

Pimba to Olympic Dam Road.

Ordered that reports be printed.

QUESTION TIME

STA TICKETING SYSTEM

Mr OLSEN: Will the Minister of Transport say whether the new bus ticketing system due for introduction next month has been the target of industrial sabotage and, if so, have police been called in to investigate? The cost of the new system was estimated at \$4.8 million in the papers presented to Parliament during the 1984-85 budget period. That has now escalated to \$10.5 million, representing a three-fold increase. This morning, we learned of plans to spend \$150 000 on a campaign to publicise the introduction of the system next month. However, there is a further cost that has not been publicly released or acknowledged. Some of the new machines have been deliberately vandalised. The Opposition has been informed that this has occurred at State Transport Authority depots, and has been subject to a report to the STA board by the management of the State Transport Authority. A conservative estimate of the damage is at least \$100 000.

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: Yes, the Crouzet equipment has been subjected to considerable damage at State Transport Authority depots, and the matter has been investigated by the Transit Squad. The Leader of the Opposition would understand that that is constituted of STA constables and members of the Police Force, and they have investigated and are continuing to investigate the matter. It is very difficult to determine who are the culprits. As the Leader of the Opposition has said that it is industrial sabotage, he may have information that is not available to me and, if

he does have that information, he should give it to the police. At this stage we know that the machines have been damaged but we do not know who has damaged them. I am not prepared to direct the blame to one particular area. I will find out how much damage has taken place, as there is a necessity to get exact details of the amount of that damage. The Leader mentions a figure of \$100 000, but it has been my experience in this place that one needs to be very cautious about estimates made by members opposite.

Mr Olsen: It is significant.

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: It is significant. Immediately I have accurate information, I will advise the Parliament.

FIREARMS CONTROLS

Mr HAMILTON: Will the Deputy Premier say whether the Government is considering introducing tighter controls over access to and availability of firearms? Recent incidents such as the macabre murders in Western Australia and the Northern Territory by the so-called 'Top End Killer' and the horrific murders and attempted murders in Victoria over the weekend have again raised the issue of gun controls in this State. Dr Wilson, of the Australian Institute of Criminology, is reported in this morning's *Advertiser* as drawing a connection between ease of access to firearms and random killings. Dr Mukherjee of the institute is reported to have claimed that stricter gun controls would save lives.

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: There has been much public and media concern expressed about these incidents, and rightly so. It is important that I set this matter in some sort of perspective. These offences more often than not involve the use of unregistered firearms by unlicensed persons; however, it is true to say that some crimes have involved registered firearms and licensed owners. Controls are required that do not discriminate unduly against legitimate firearm users such as sporting shooters and hunters. Under the present Act there are procedures for obtaining firearm licences that require a review of every application. The Registrar has a wide discretion for refusing applications with the concurrence of the Firearms Consultative Committee, which was established under the Act to review these decisions.

The process relating to hand guns is being reviewed with a view to imposing conditions relating to the carriage of these weapons. Such conditions will relate to reasons given on an application; for example, a person who is an active pistol club member and seeks a licence on that basis will have his or her licence endorsed with a condition for pistol club purposes. In such circumstances a person carrying a weapon for other use would be in breach of the condition on the licence. There has to be some flexibility; for example, for servicing arrangements for firearms and the like, and such activities will be permissible.

A task force including representatives of sporting shooters and the security industry is being formed to advise the Government on the manner in which these conditions can be enforced. To date, the Commissioner has not given me any advice about extending these recommendations to rifles and shotguns. As I mentioned earlier, the majority of offences are committed with unregistered firearms. It is a cause of considerable concern that many offences are committed using firearms stolen from registered and licensed owners. Since 1981, 2 579 firearms have been reported as stolen in South Australia and have not been recovered; that figure includes 948 hand guns.

The Western Australian Police Minister wrote to me recently suggesting a need for national firearm legislation. I

believe that that suggestion has merit and would ensure that there were no gaps in controls. I will be pursuing that matter through the Australian Police Ministers Council. Another source of concern to the Government is the cost of administering the whole system, and we are actively seeking a review of charges that we will have to make to ensure that people who use guns are paying for the administration of their use.

We are keen to tighten hand gun controls. The matter of national firearm legislation will be pursued through the national Police Ministers Council, and I will be seeking advice from the Police Commissioner on the need for or advisability of introducing further controls on rifles and shotguns. In conclusion, let me say that licensed firearm holders should ensure that their weapons are secure, thereby reducing the chance of theft.

STA TICKETING SYSTEM

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: My question is to the Minister of Transport. Who, other than STA employees, has had access to the new ticketing machines, and what action has been taken to increase security since the vandalism was first reported? The introduction of this new system has been very strongly opposed by the unions ever since it was announced in 1984. Some union officials have previously made it very clear to the Opposition that their members would never accept it.

In the *News* on 28 April 1986, the State Secretary of the Union of Locomotive Enginemen (Mr Phillips) said that the Government would rue the day it decided to take on this new system because it was going to cost more than it would save. The unions already have engaged in industrial disputation over the new system, and the Opposition is now informed that this has been taken a step further with deliberate industrial sabotage. In these circumstances, the Minister needs to explain why the police, as such, have not been called in, rather than the investigatory group within the department, and who, other than STA employees have had access to these machines.

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: I want to make it absolutely clear to the Deputy Leader of the Opposition that the STA Transit Squad includes members of the South Australian Police Force, with all the powers and authority of the South Australian Police Force. They are police officers, and they are investigating the damage to the Crouzet equipment. There would be very little access to the Crouzet equipment in STA buses and trains by other than STA employees, and I am well aware of that.

In fact, I have informed the senior officers of the AT&MOEA—and I cannot be certain that we contacted the ARU, but certainly I had a meeting with the AT&MOEA—that if there is any evidence at all that their members are involved in what the Opposition now tells me is industrial sabotage—and if they have evidence or information of that I will be pleased to have it—very severe disciplinary actions, including dismissal and civil action, will be taken against the offending parties.

They have assured me that, to the best of their knowledge, none of their members were involved. Nevertheless, the police and the STA Transit Squad—who are police officers, with all the powers of police officers in relation to the STA operations—are fully investigating this whole matter. As I said earlier, there is little access to people outside the STA but, on the other hand, because many people are involved in the STA other than people who drive the trains or buses, many other people in the STA who have access, I do not

want in any way to place a cloud of suspicion on anyone who works at the STA. I can assure the honourable member that there has been added security which, I have been informed, has reduced the incidence of damage. Investigations are proceeding, and we hope to find the guilty people and take the appropriate action.

HENLEY BEACH ROAD

Mr PLUNKETT: Would the Minister of Transport inform me of any plans for future widening of Henley Beach Road between South Road and Bakewell Bridge, Mile End? During the past week I have been approached by a group concerning buildings in this area known as Morans buildings.

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: I thank the honourable member for his question. I, and I expect many other members, have been contacted by people concerned about the road widening program in which the Government is involved to that part of Henley Beach Road. Some historical perspective would be useful here. The metropolitan road widening plan was agreed to in 1946 and has been on the statute book since that time. The road widening has been strongly promoted by the local council and, as Minister of Local Government and as Minister of Transport, I have been lobbied by the council. It has shown me the development plans in which it believes the council area could be involved if we are able to fix up the entrance to the city through Bakewell bridge.

As the road widening requires demolition of some buildings, Morans Corner was involved. As is the normal process, the Highways Department checked with the Department of Environment and Planning as to whether or not heritage listing attached to those buildings. We were told that they were merely old buildings with no heritage listing. On the basis of that information, instruction was given to the Highways Department to contract a demolition expert to demolish the buildings. That has taken time, because the demolition company wanted to salvage some of the fittings, and so the demolition has been delayed. On being approached by a group of architects consultants, I again contacted the Department of Environment and Planning to see whether its Heritage Branch would reconfirm that no heritage listing attached to the buildings. It reconfirmed that that was the case, and therefore I approved the demolition.

I am unable to give the honourable member any time scale for the roadworks involved. Resources are such that we cannot progress with planning and design at this stage, but as soon as I am in a position to do so I will inform the honourable member and the council. I again reinforce the fact that the Highways Department has consistently had the strong support of the council in making that part of Henley Beach Road more accessible to the city, with egress from the city being a whole lot easier for people in the western suburbs. Council will be involved in some very interesting development programs in which hitherto it has been unable to be involved.

BRIDGEWATER RAILWAY LINE

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: Will the Minister of Transport say why he has refused to provide members of the Opposition with a copy of a document relating to a meeting in 1984 to discuss the Bridgewater railway line, despite his promise to the House last week—

Members interjecting:

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

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: I quote from what the Minister had to say last Thursday in this Chamber:

I am happy to let any member, including the member for Heyesen, have a copy of the document.

After quoting from the document in the House on Thursday, the Minister was asked by the Speaker if he was quoting from part of an official docket. The Minister replied that he was not, thereby avoiding having to table the document. At the conclusion of Question Time, I visited the Minister's office in order to take up his invitation to see the document to which he had referred. I was advised by him that the document in question was no longer available for scrutiny—as promised—because it had left Parliament House along with other official dockets and was *en route* to his ministerial office.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! For the benefit of those members who did not hear me before, I repeat that the honourable member for Heyesen has the floor.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: Further inquiries by me to the Minister's office as recently as this morning have met with a similar lack of success, a situation which is particularly curious, as the Minister advised the House that the document was in no way part of an official docket, yet he is having remarkable difficulty in making it available.

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: The first point that needs to be made, as the member for Heyesen was himself a Minister at one time (he has obviously given up hope of being one again), is that Ministers invariably have a bag which includes information for Question Time: that is certainly my practice. That bag includes my briefing papers and other papers that have been prepared for me on a whole range of subjects, and, after Question Time each day, I send that bag back to my office. When the honourable member raised this matter last Thursday, he came across to this side of the Chamber and I showed him the paper from which I had been reading. He then walked back to his seat and was involved in a whole series of attacks on me. After that, and after what happened last Thursday, he now wants me to give him another opportunity to look at the briefing papers provided for me. However, they are not part of a document and there is no responsibility on me to show these documents to the honourable member.

I was prepared to do so, and I did so. He then returned to his chair. Since then, I have been subjected to a number of allegations and accusations. I understand that the matter has been referred to the Standing Orders Committee and, that being so, I have withdrawn the offer to provide the honourable member or his colleagues with a copy. Let me reassure you, Mr Speaker, and the House that the document from which I was quoting is a summary prepared for me by my departmental officers. It is my document and I do not think that any other member need worry about asking again to have a look at it.

Members interjecting:

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

The Hon. D.C. Wotton: What have you got to hide?

The SPEAKER: Order! I call the member for Heyesen to order. The honourable member for Newland.

ABORIGINAL DEATHS

Ms GAYLER: Will the Minister of Aboriginal Affairs say whether the State Government will cooperate fully with any Commonwealth Government moves to initiate an inquiry

at the national level into the tragic deaths of young Aboriginal men in police or prison custody? There have been 18 Aboriginal deaths in custody over the past 12 months, including that of one South Australian Aboriginal man. There is also a disproportionate imprisonment rate for Aborigines. The Human Rights and Equal Opportunity Commission, which during the recent election campaign the Opposition proposed to abolish, has been investigating conditions of Aborigines in Queensland and New South Wales border towns.

Members interjecting:

Mr GUNN: On a point of order, Mr Speaker, during the course of asking her question, the honourable member was commenting. I refer you, Sir, to the last Question Time of the last session of Parliament when you dealt severely with the Deputy Leader of the Opposition, and I ask for a ruling on this occasion.

The SPEAKER: Order! Unfortunately the Chair cannot fully appreciate the point of order raised by the honourable member for Eyre, because my attention was taken away by the unruly interjections from my left-hand side. I can assure the honourable member that, in relation to comments made when asking a question, I would be equally vigilant with the member for Newland as with any other member on either side of the House.

Ms GAYLER: In view of the 1976 referendum giving the Federal Government power in relation to Aboriginal affairs matters, I am interested in the State Government's view on this matter.

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: I thank the honourable member for her important question. Obviously, there is a very real need for a national inquiry into this most unfortunate and distressing situation. I understand that in Australia there have been 16 deaths of Aboriginal persons being held in custody either in prisons or in police cells, and some eight of those have been in the State of Queensland and one has occurred in South Australia. I give the House the undertaking that the South Australian Government will give full support to the inquiry into this matter that I understand the Federal Government proposes to establish. I was pleased to learn not only of the strong support of the Queensland Minister of Aboriginal Affairs (Mr Katter) but also of the speedy implementation of the federal inquiry. I understand that, in the next few weeks, there will be a meeting of Commonwealth and State Ministers responsible for police and correctional services at which this matter will be further discussed.

I believe that in recent years in South Australia considerable progress has been made in the area of police-Aboriginal relations. I commend the work of the Commissioner of Police (Mr Hunt) for the initiatives that he has established in this area, including police aids, and in a number of other areas that have borne fruit already. I commend also the work that has been done in the correctional services area, where there has been a dramatic growth in expenditure and an increase in the provision of new services relating to training of staff and the like to assist in the rehabilitation and care of those persons who are in custody. As I mentioned, in South Australia we have had one death of an Aboriginal person in custody and that is one death too many. I understand that since 1960 we have had 16 deaths of Aboriginal persons in custody and, obviously, we do not have, nor does any other State in Australia have, a proud record with respect to our relations with the Aboriginal community in this area. The sooner that we have an inquiry into this matter and recommendations are made as to how we can remedy the situation, the better it will be.

STANDING ORDERS COMMITTEE

Mr OSWALD: Why have you, Mr Speaker, not called a meeting of the Standing Orders Committee, as you undertook to do last Thursday, following the quoting by the Minister of Transport from a document believed to be part of an official docket?

An honourable member interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

An honourable member interjecting:

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

An honourable member interjecting:

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

The Hon. D.C. Wotton: We are questioning—

The SPEAKER: Order! I call the honourable member for Heysen to order for the second time.

Mr OSWALD: In response to a question from the Chair, the Minister categorically denied that he was quoting from an official docket. It was then indicated that he was quoting from a photocopy of an official docket. In response to a call for your clarification of this situation, you, Sir, promised to refer the matter to the Standing Orders Committee. This committee has not met for five months and, considering the question of propriety in this instance, I question why such a meeting has not been called as a matter of urgency, particularly because today the offer to reveal the contents to the member for Heysen has been withdrawn.

The SPEAKER: First, the Standing Orders Committee was appointed by resolution only last Thursday. Secondly, that Standing Orders Committee will be—

An honourable member interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The Chair is in a difficult position when, during a reply like this to a question, it has to then call a member of the House to order. I ask the Leader of the Opposition not to place me in that difficult position. Secondly, that Standing Orders Committee will be called together in due course, because there are other matters to be given consideration that were undertaken during the last session, including the approach to be taken towards lengthy explanations of questions that stray into debate, the number of questions (unfortunately, there are fewer and fewer of them each day) that are asked during Question Time, and matters to do with the suspension of members. Those members who were on the Standing Orders Committee would be aware that these matters have been canvassed previously and that during the break submissions were sought from members of the House. Unfortunately, I can report that only one submission was received from any member of this Chamber.

The third point is that if the honourable member refers back to the relevant *Hansard* extract—the proof copy only being available at the moment—of last Thursday he will note that the Speaker asked the following question of the honourable the Minister:

Is the document from which the honourable Minister has quoted part of an official docket?

To that question the Minister gave the following quite clear response:

No, Mr Speaker. I have been around long enough not to fall for that.

I am in no position to question the integrity of any Minister of this House when he gives a response to a question directed to him either by another member or by myself.

Mr Lewis interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! It is my understanding that the document being used by the Minister was a private briefing

paper that was not part of an official docket. As such, there was no requirement on the honourable Minister to table it. That ruling was in complete agreement with previous rulings given by previous incumbents of the Chair.

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: On a point of order, Mr Speaker, you indicated the items that would be referred to the Standing Orders Committee. Will you also refer to the Standing Orders Committee the length of time taken by Ministers to answer questions?

The SPEAKER: I cannot uphold that as a point of order, but I will take it on board.

OLYMPIC SPORTS FIELD

Ms LENEHAN: Will the Minister of Recreation and Sport advise the House what expenditure, if any, will be required of the South Australian Government to complete the resurfacing of the athletics track at Olympic Sports Field? The Minister recently announced that the Federal Government had agreed to make a significant contribution towards the project under its national sports facilities program. The Minister further stated that he would have to discuss in Cabinet the need for State funds for the new track. As the Federal program funds are normally made available only on a dollar-for-dollar basis, will the Minister advise how South Australia's contribution, if any, will be financed?

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: I am delighted to be able to inform the House that the financial arrangements and negotiations have been finalised with all the parties involved. As members would recall, this situation has been before Parliament previously in relation to questions asked about the future of the athletics track and, particularly, in relation to developments at Olympic Sports Field. The parties involved are the State and Federal Governments, the Athletics Association, and Superturf Holdings Limited of Australia—its trading name being Regupol.

In relation to the contract price of \$595 000 for the complete resurfacing of the track and for ancillary facilities, the contribution from the Federal Government will be about \$350 000. The member for Mawson has asked about the dollar-for-dollar subsidy arrangement. In relation to the old contract that existed prior to the renegotiation, penalty clauses were invoked and as a consequence sums of money were paid to Regupol Australia Pty Limited. Those penalties have now been accumulated within the calculation for the matching dollar-for-dollar sum required to replace the surface. Included in the contribution will be \$75 000 from the Athletics Association, and \$165 000, which has already been paid by the State Government to Regupol, which will be matched dollar-for-dollar by the Commonwealth. A small sum of about \$5 000 will also be added from the sports facility fund. The resurfacing will be undertaken and, we hope, completed either late this year or early next year so that arrangements for the athletics program can be finalised with the South Australian Athletics Association.

I reiterate that the money contributed by the South Australian Government came out of the amount of the previous contract that was seen as part of the penalty payment. We have used every dollar of that money for the athletics track. I believe that it is a financial plus for South Australia that we are now receiving a contribution from the Commonwealth fund. As the member has said, that is the Federal Government's contribution through the National Facilities Fund, which requires a dollar-for-dollar subsidy. I was delighted with the assistance given by a number of people from the athletics community in South Australia, and I

acknowledge the contribution made by the President, Mr David Prince, and Mr Boswell, who went to West Germany with a principal of Regupol Australia and inspected tracks in West Germany and England prior to negotiations being finalised. I believe that that was a significant step forward in our getting agreement between Regupol, the Federal Government and the Athletics Association.

I also acknowledge the patience and excellent support of Regupol in its negotiations with the State Government over the past year and a half. I am delighted to tell members of the athletics community that we will have a new surface at Olympic Sports Field, that negotiations with the Burnside council are proceeding satisfactorily and that I look forward to future discussions with them about the use of this facility.

STA FINANCES

Mr INGERSON: Can the Minister of Transport say whether the Government's failure to hedge against foreign currency fluctuations added \$6.3 million to STA losses? The Opposition has been informed that one reason for the escalation in the cost of the new ticketing system, the Adelaide railway and metropolitan resignalling project, and the purchase of new buses, was the failure of the Government adequately to hedge borrowings against the significant currency fluctuations that have occurred since 1984. This has added \$6.3 million to the cost of these contracts, the equivalent of a nine cent fare rise for every journey taken on STA buses, trains and trams in 1986.

Members interjecting:

Mr Gregory: Shut up.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Mitcham.

Mr S.J. BAKER: Is the honourable member allowed to abuse the House while out of his seat, Sir?

The SPEAKER: The honourable member for Florey should have been aware that his conduct was out of order. I accept the point raised by the honourable member for Mitcham, but in so doing ask all members to refrain from the sorts of provocative interjections that have been taking place. The honourable Minister of Transport.

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: I mention for the benefit of the House that a person who was a member of the STA board at the time the Opposition was in government informed me a few moments ago that the cost of signalling equipment purchased overseas during their time was not hedged against the currency devaluation, and that its cost was added to significantly. There seems to be a great deal of concern on the Opposition benches that there be a cut-off period of five years so that they can wash their hands of any responsibility that they had while in Government for the initial investigation in the normal process of developing propositions to purchase new and sophisticated equipment. The tender, as I recall, when placed was for \$6.3 million or \$6.4 million.

Mr Ingerson: For \$4.5 million.

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: An amount of \$4.5 million might well have been the figure mentioned at the beginning of the contract process. I will bring back a detailed report on this matter for Parliament because, here again, when speaking of finances of this nature, Parliament is entitled to a detailed response, so it will have that. No, Sir; I do not believe that the STA was negligent in not hedging against currency devaluations any more than I believe that all those other Government and private enterprise entities

throughout Australia were negligent when they were caught out to an extensive degree as a result of the currency devaluation. I will bring down a considered reply for the House.

McINTYRE ROAD

Mr GREGORY: Will the Minister of Transport request the Commissioner of Highways to advertise within the appropriate area that McIntyre Road between Bridge Road and Mill Road is now open? The principal reason for the building of McIntyre Road was to provide a quick and easily travelled route for residents of the north-eastern suburbs to the Elizabeth and Salisbury areas, and to take this through traffic from residential streets such as Billabong and Murrell Roads. The portion of the road mentioned in the question has been open for some weeks. Residents who live in Billabong and Murrell Roads have informed me that, since the opening of McIntyre Road, traffic on these roads has hardly been reduced.

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: I thank the honourable member for his question. It seems that travellers from one suburb through the honourable member's electorate to another are taking some time to realise that the work on McIntyre Road has been completed to such a degree as to allow that thoroughfare to take an increased percentage of the traffic. I will talk to the Highways Commissioner at my meeting with him in the morning to see whether it is necessary to devise a strategy to alert people to a quicker and easier way of reaching their destination.

PURCHASE OF TROUBRIDGE

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: Why has the Minister of Transport made an untrue public statement about the financial capacity of a South Australian syndicate to buy the *Troubridge*? In this morning's *Advertiser*, the Minister is reported to have said that the local syndicate interested in buying the *Troubridge* to operate cruises in South Australian gulf waters had been unable to show evidence of financial capacity to buy the vessel. However, evidence presented to the Opposition completely contradicts the Minister's statement.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: I have in my possession a copy of a letter to the Minister from the Manager of the Norwood branch of the National Australia Bank. It is dated 4 August and makes it very clear that the syndicate did have the financial capacity to buy the *Troubridge*. The letter was produced following the Minister's decision, the previous day, to give the syndicate time to make a firm offer.

Based on this confirmation, the syndicate also signed an offer drawn up by the Department of Transport for \$380 000 to buy the *Troubridge*. However, when the syndicate then contacted the Melbourne broker handling the sale of the *Troubridge*, it was advised that the broker had received no instructions from the Minister and could not therefore proceed with further negotiations. These facts show that, even though the South Australian syndicate had met the Minister's requirements with respect to demonstrating financial capacity, its negotiations were rendered impossible by the failure of the Minister to give proper instructions to the broker.

The SPEAKER: The last few words sound like comment. The honourable Minister of Transport.

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: I guess I thank the honourable member for his question. What I have to do is not a

very pleasant task for me, because I have some regard for the people in Gulf Cruises, who then become Alorean (No. 9), in the extensive dealings they have had with the Government over a period of time. I will go through the chronology of events and, having raised this matter, the honourable member I hope will not complain about the length of my answer. I will deal straight away with the point that the honourable member has made about this firm letter from the National Bank (Norwood branch). In all fairness that letter ought to be read to the House. It is a very firm commitment, if one listens to the honourable member opposite. I am quoting from notes which have been provided for me by my department and which state:

Alorean (No. 9) Pty Ltd is a customer of the bank and is considered good for its business engagements. A cheque for \$380 000 (three hundred and eighty thousand dollars) presented for payment on or before 3 September 1987 would in the ordinary course of operations on this account be paid. The bank cannot be taken as undertaking or guaranteeing payment of any cheque so presented and specifically disclaims for itself and its affairs any responsibility for the information contained in this letter.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: In the ordinary—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: The document that the member for Light refers to—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Mawson has a point of order?

Ms LENEHAN: My point of order is that because of the noise from members opposite members on this side cannot hear what the Minister is reading.

The SPEAKER: I uphold the point of order raised by the member for Mawson, because the Chair also had difficulty hearing the Minister. The honourable Minister.

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: The particular offer made by a principal of Alorean who arrived at my office on Tuesday with a letter from the bank but no offer had to be done at the instigation of my departmental officers because there was no formal offer for the Minister or the Government to look at. The wording of that very short offer was drawn up with officers of my department and a principal of Alorean (No. 9). It stated:

On behalf of Alorean (No. 9) Pty Ltd, I hereby offer \$380 000 for the purchase of the M.V. *Troubridge*. This offer is not conditional on the availability of finance although Alorean (No. 9) does reserve its position on other aspects of the *pro forma* previously sent to us.

The Crown Solicitor's advice on those documents was as follows:

(The offer of Alorean is only an invitation to negotiate on the basis of the price suggested.

That is the Crown Solicitor's advice. This was after weeks and weeks of negotiation and assistance by the Government to help these people put the offer to Government. On 20 November 1986—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: If the honourable member is patient he will understand why this advice is necessary. Members opposite do not want to hear. This is the chronology of events. On 20 November I met with the syndicate, which advised the Highways Department that it was interested in purchasing the *Troubridge*. They asked us to provide cost operation information, which we did. That information was provided in December 1986. On 28 January 1987 the syndicate was advised by telephone of the appointment of South-West Chartering as brokers. We gave the name, address and phone number of the contact person. On 4 February 1987 the syndicate wrote to me expressing

disappointment at the appointment of a broker despite the fact that they were told that this would be the track down which we would be going, and, if we did not, we would be subject to criticism, not only by the Public Accounts Committee but also the Auditor-General and members opposite.

They expressed disappointment at the appointment of a broker and indicated that the syndicate had undertaken considerable planning and further investigation since the November meeting and sought a further meeting. On 25 February I wrote to the syndicate pointing out Government involvement in the project. That was not a matter for me as Minister of Transport—I was only interested in selling the vessel, and I told them that they should speak to the Minister of Tourism.

On 6 March, the syndicate wrote to the Premier seeking a meeting. On 1 April the syndicate advised, by letter, that Southwest Chartering was advertising the boat. So, we advised them that the boat was being advertised. On 8 April, the syndicate wrote to the Minister of Tourism, not the broker. We had put this into the hands of the broker. The syndicate wrote to the Minister of Tourism offering net brokerage value of \$200 000. I think that that represents the scrap value. On 11 May 1987, the Premier wrote to the syndicate advising it to put the bid (net breakage) through the broker—the deadline given was 22 May—offering opportunity to put forward elaboration of supporting information—with the deadline, again, of 22 May.

Members should realise the length of time that we have been trying to help these people. They wanted the Government to give them the first right of refusal but we told them we could not do that. On 19 May 1987, the syndicate wrote to the Premier arguing in general terms the benefits of the project to the State. They then formalised their breakage value bid with the broker, because the tendering period had ended.

On 1 June, after the State Supply Board had considered the tenders and recommended the sale to a Greek syndicate, Cabinet agreed to sell the vessel to that syndicate. As a result of further approaches by the syndicate, and with the approval of my Cabinet colleagues, on 11 June, nearly a fortnight after the Cabinet decision, I met with the syndicate and advised it of the Government's willingness to consider a further bid. I gave the syndicate five working days, with a deadline of 18 June 1987. The syndicate had been working on this since the previous November and, on 11 June I gave it an additional five working days.

On 15 June, they met with officers of my department and asked whether officers from the Tourism, Marine and Harbors and State Development Departments could sit down with them and advise them on the viability of the project. In the event they neglected the advice, which was an appropriate commercial decision for them to make. The advice was that this was a marginal project, but that is for the private enterprise people to judge for themselves, and we make no judgment on them for that. On 19 June I wrote to the syndicate requiring a bid and evidence of financial capacity to purchase the boat, and I gave a deadline of 22 June. So, it was extended a few more weeks.

On 22 June, the syndicate lodged a bid of \$380 000 with the broker and wrote to me through Price Waterhouse seeking a period of exclusivity or an option for two months. I wrote to the syndicate through Price Waterhouse indicating that evidence of financial capacity had not been provided and that the broker would negotiate the contract. I gave the deadline of 29 June 1987. Yet here are this Minister and Government who are difficult to get on with! A draft contract was then provided for the syndicate for finalisation; that was on 23 June. The syndicate wrote to me responding

to my letter and expressing disappointment. It then advised that the company Aloren (No. 9) had been formed. On 29 June 1987, Westpac wrote to me with what was supposed to be a letter of support for the syndicate. Sir Humphrey Appleby could not have written a better letter: it was so confusing that it meant nothing.

The syndicate wrote to the brokers stating that it wanted changes to the contract, but it did not specify the changes. Even though every other tenderer had accepted the contract and was able to bid to it, the syndicate in South Australia was unable to tender to that contract document and wanted it changed. On 2 July 1987, Mr Foreman phoned Mr Southern on my behalf, advising concern at no evidence of financial capacity which would be needed by the close of business on Friday. Now, the closing date has been extended to 3 July. I wrote to the syndicate seeking a deposition with evidence of financial capacity and agreement as to the terms of the contract. The broker telexed Mr Foreman of the Highways Department expressing concern at the delay. It was important to sell the boat when prospective buyers could inspect it while it was still in use. The market for a vessel of this age was difficult and, if the delays were so extensive that the vessel was no longer in use, the price the taxpayer could expect for the vessel would be reduced markedly.

On 3 July the syndicate wrote to the broker (tenders closed on 1 June) seeking changes to the contract which among other things would avoid the deposit, together with evidence of financial capacity and timing requirements. On 8 July, the Government broker wrote to the Aloren board and their offer had not then been resolved. On 10 July P.V. Fairweather sent me a cheque for \$38 000 as a deposit on the \$380 000 bid. Attached to that cheque was the statement, 'If eventual agreement not reached cheque should be refunded.' Yet on 10 July they were still not able to put a firm tender to the Government. They said, 'Here is a deposit of \$38 000 but, if we do not agree, we want our \$38 000 back.' Every other tenderer was willing to provide cash up front: there was no question whether or not funds were available.

On 16 July, I wrote to Fairweather pointing out that the syndicate had not met the conditions and that we could not proceed with the syndicate's offer. However, on 20 July the syndicate wrote to the broker stating that it should still be negotiating and finalising the contract. On 22 July Southwest Chartering wrote to the syndicate restating the position at 8 July. On 22 July the syndicate wrote to me regretting the return of the \$38 000, stating that the pro forma had been poorly presented and asking for fair and reasonable consideration to progress its venture in a proper commercial manner on a solid financial basis.

That was on 22 July, yet tenders closed on 1 June. The syndicate complained of 'continual requests for performances of commercial feats within impossible time parameters'—time parameters that had been met by everyone else. The syndicate asked me to direct the broker to reopen negotiations. On 23 July the highest tenderer—the Greek consortium—retendered at a much lower price and effectively withdrew its offer. It withdrew from negotiations on 23 July. As Minister, I delayed proceeding with that contract for over six weeks, nearly two months, to the extent that the successful tenderer had decided to retender at a much lower price, and that sale was lost to the taxpayers of South Australia.

On 30 July, the United Trades and Labor Council Shipbuilding and Waterfront Committee requested the Premier and the Minister not to break off negotiations with the South Australian consortium. That is fair and proper because

that committee was involved in construction work and employment. On 3 August, I met with a principal of the syndicate in my office and told him, 'All you've been required to do is give me either a cheque or a letter indicating clearly that the money is available without question—unconditionally, without strings attached. If you can provide me with that by 4 p.m. today, that will be sufficient.'

That was two months after tenders had closed—two months of trying to get these people to give the Government a document that was acceptable commercially. The principal replied, 'There's no problem about that. I'll have a cheque for you by 4 o'clock.' I was in Cabinet at 4 o'clock and was prepared to put to Cabinet—even then, on 3 August—this offer from the syndicate, because the Government was anxious to give a South Australian syndicate every opportunity to be involved in a tourist venture in this State. That was the only basis on which we continued to hang in there. We did not need to do so. We had all the advice available to us legally to proceed with the sale but we gave this syndicate every opportunity.

The principal said that the syndicate had missed some exams but that we would have an offer by 4 p.m., and I indicated that, if it did that, I would take the offer to Cabinet which was sitting at the time. At 4 p.m., the principal rang to say that he could not provide the documentation because his bank manager had not yet returned from lunch. However, he said that he would continue to try. That was at 4 o'clock in the afternoon. That morning he guaranteed that that documentation would be available, but when the deadline came his bank manager was out to lunch and could not be contacted. He telephoned me in the evening and said an offer would be made next day.

The Hon. B.C. Eastick interjecting:

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: Yes, he was. I gave them every opportunity. On 4 August they presented me with a document. They spoke to me on Monday and they were informed that we had another significantly higher offer, because in the initial tendering process Gold Copper was the second highest tenderer. That tender was renegotiated and it offered a significantly higher price. Alore (No. 9) was aware of that, and that the bid was significantly higher than its \$380 000 bid, but said that it would stick to the \$380 000 bid and hoped that the Government would be able to make that subsidy or grant of \$25 000 available.

I said to the company, 'You go back and give us a firm bid, and I will check up as to whether or not we can countenance that bid in light of the negotiations that have taken place between the broker and Gold Copper.' Gold Copper is a South Australian incorporated company which does most of its business in Queensland. Mr Reinhardt said that in South Australia significant refurbishing work would be undertaken, and he made some other suggestions about work that his company would undertake in South Australia. I must say that none of this influenced the decision. The decision that I needed to make was based on whether or not I had the firm prospect of an unconditional cash offer in my hands.

On 5 August the Commissioner of Highways contacted me and strongly recommended that, as no financial capacity had been shown by the South Australian syndicate, the vessel should be sold to Gold Copper. The Crown Solicitor advised that the offer to Alore (No. 9) was only an invitation to negotiate on the basis of the price suggested. The Crown Solicitor advised also of the dangers to the South Australian Government.

Mr Ingerson interjecting:

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: Gold Copper gave a quite clear unconditional offer to the broker. That was something

that the South Australian syndicate was unable to do. The advice of the Crown Solicitor was that, if the Gold Copper contract was not accepted, there were dangers for the South Australian Government in that probably it was legally obliged to proceed. If the sale did not proceed, there was a danger that Gold Copper and the broker would sue the Government and that, to reject the Gold Copper offer, could be dangerous legally, and commercially unwise. That is the story of the process from the day that I first had contact with people, at least one of whom I have known reasonably well, until the day that the sale and the final decision was taken.

The Gulf Cruises syndicate, or Alore (No. 9), as it subsequently called itself, was given more opportunity than one would expect a Government to give a company. The stage was reached where the commercial credibility of the Government was at risk. Further, the broker's reputation within the industry was quite seriously at risk, and we had reached the stage where we had lost one successful tender and we were very likely to lose a second successful tender. At that stage we still did not have a firm offer: on the advice given to me by the Crown Solicitor we merely had an offer to negotiate on the price and the conditions of contract associated with the sale. The words of the Alore (No. 9) principal, who insisted that they be inserted in the two short paragraph offer, at my officer's insistence, stated:

Alore (No. 9) does reserve its decision on other aspects of the proforma previously sent to the Government.

I can assure members that, during the discussions that I had with members of the syndicate, those concerns that they had about the pro forma were serious, and they were of such seriousness to them that they could not provide an unconditional offer.

Mr LEWIS: During the course of the Minister's answer—

The SPEAKER: This is a point of order that the honourable member wishes to raise and not the notice of motion that he earlier mentioned to me?

Mr LEWIS: On a point of order, Mr Speaker, during the course of the answer that the Minister has just given to the House, he referred to a number of papers, and read some words contained in some of those papers. Will you, as Speaker, undertake to examine the record to see whether it constitutes part of a ministerial docket and, if so, will you require the Minister to table it? Secondly, as a point of clarification, on what terms will you accept a Minister's word that he is not quoting from a docket; in other words, can a Minister simply lie and you will accept that?

The SPEAKER: Before dealing with the two points of order raised by the member for Murray-Mallee, I must ask him to withdraw the unparliamentary word 'lie'.

Mr LEWIS: Then I do that, Mr Speaker, and substitute 'tell a gross untruth'.

The SPEAKER: In order to save inconveniencing the House, could I suggest to the honourable member that, if he wishes to make the particular point that I think he is trying to make, he unconditionally withdraw the word 'lie' and perhaps merely uses the phrase 'mislead the House'.

Mr LEWIS: I do that, Mr Speaker.

The SPEAKER: As to the first point of order, the answer is 'No'. In relation to the second point of order, I reiterate what I said earlier this afternoon. I intend to not question the integrity of individual members and, further to the point that was raised earlier this afternoon with regard to this matter and the Standing Orders Committee, I point out to members of the House that the role of the Standing Orders Committee is to deal with the rules themselves. If members wish to make any imputations against another member, that can be done in one of two ways: either by establishing a Privileges Committee to inquire into a particular matter,

or by way of substantive motion in the House so that members themselves all have the opportunity to discuss the alleged infraction.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION: BELAIR-BRIDGEWATER RAIL SERVICE

Mr S.G. EVANS (Davenport): I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

Mr S.G. EVANS: Today in the House the Minister of Transport responded to what happened in this House last week when I made a personal explanation regarding some comments in the community about a statement that the Minister made in this House that was reported on 5DN. I believe that it was reported on 5DN before he made the statement to the House, but even after a personal explanation was given in this House, at about 11 o'clock that evening. That report states:

The Minister of Transport, Gavin Keneally, fired back the results from a meeting back in 1984 attended by two of his harshest critics, Stan Evans and David Wotton.

The tape transcription is as follows:

Keneally: Conclusions resulting from the involvement of the community were: (a) the Belair-Bridgewater train service should be removed and replaced in part by bus services.

Journalist: The Opposition responded by asking the Minister if he would make available copies of the minutes of the meeting.

Mr Keneally replied that he would be happy to give copies to anybody who asked for them. First of all, that part of the matter has not been honoured. However, the way that I am affected is as follows. I did attend the meeting held on 28 November. It was three days before a Federal election. The committee wound up its business early because a Federal election was imminent and they knew of the forthcoming delays due to Christmas, and so on.

A vote of any type was not taken at that meeting, yet the Minister set out to say to this House that Wotton, Brown, and Evans were there for one purpose only—namely, to imply that they agreed to the proposal. I will come back to that soon. On Thursday 6 August the Minister also said that the first conclusion resulting from the involvement of the community was that the Belair-Bridgewater train service should be removed and replaced in part by bus services. I will not go into the others. But from what the Minister said today someone has told an untruth, either those who advise him or himself. However, even after having read the report of the meeting of 28 November, when there was a discussion on this, the Minister of Transport said:

The recommendations of the working party were presented under two categories—those with which the working party were generally in agreement—

'generally in agreement', not 'agreed'—
and those that warranted further discussion.

The Hon. G.F. Keneally interjecting:

Mr S.G. EVANS: Let us see what you said first. It was said:

It was generally agreed that there should be some rationalisation—

with which I still agree—

of the Belair-Bridgewater rail service due to its duplication of other services.

Then the Minister went on to say today—which is accurate:

It was recommended that further discussion was warranted on the future of the train service, and two options were put to the liaison meeting.

Further discussion was recommended; there was no agreement on it. The first option to be considered was:

Replace Adelaide-Bridgewater train service with a Belair-Bridgewater shuttle train service.

This did not involve eliminating the train service at all, as the Minister has inferred in both of his statements. Option 2—the last of them all—was:

Replace the Belair-Bridgewater train service with a weekday Blackwood-Stirling bus service via Upper Sturt Road.

There was never an agreement on the last two options or even on the first one. But the Minister in his statement last week said this—which I say was a deliberate untruth. Without any doubt at all the idea was to get a message over to the public that the member for Heysen, the ex-member for Davenport (Hon. Dean Brown), and I agreed to those resolutions.

The Hon. D.C. Wotton interjecting:

Mr S.G. EVANS: This is what he said. He said that five points were agreed.

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: On a point of order, Mr Speaker, I ask the member for Heysen to withdraw the allegation that the Minister has lied. It is exactly the statement that has been reported to me that he is making outside the House, and that he now wants to make inside the House. I ask that the word 'lie' and his allegation be withdrawn unconditionally.

The SPEAKER: Order! The Chair did not hear the content of that particular interjection. I ask the honourable member for Heysen whether he did use that expression.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: Yes.

The SPEAKER: Could I ask him then to withdraw it?

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: No, Mr Speaker.

The SPEAKER: The honourable member is not prepared to withdraw the unparliamentary expression. Well, I have no alternative, if he persists in that course of action, other than to name him.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: Mr Speaker, I seek leave to explain.

The SPEAKER: Order! The Chair calls upon, in fact directs, the honourable member for Heysen to withdraw the unparliamentary expression which was used. We can then proceed with other matters after that has been dealt with. The honourable member for Heysen.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: No, Mr Speaker.

The SPEAKER: Order! I take the word 'No' to mean that the honourable member is defying the instruction of the Chair.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: Yes, Mr Speaker.

The SPEAKER: In that case, I have absolutely no alternative but to name the honourable member for Heysen.

Mr Lewis: Why didn't you name Jack Wright four years ago?

The SPEAKER: Order! I call the member for Murray-Mallee to order, and remind him that we are dealing with an extremely serious matter at the moment, which is not one that should be accompanied by remarks likely to induce an air of levity. Does the member for Heysen now wish to be heard in explanation for defying the Chair?

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: Yes, Mr Speaker. On a number of occasions this afternoon the Minister has backed down and told untruths in this place, and as far as I am concerned, Sir, he has lied in this Parliament. He has misled the Parliament in what he said on Thursday on a number of occasions. First of all, he said (and I quote from *Hansard*):

I am happy to let any member, including the member for Heysen, have a copy of the document...

This is the document about which there has been so much discussion. As I explained to the House earlier, I have taken every opportunity to obtain that docket so that I could refer to it and so that I could see exactly what the Minister has said. On three occasions he has refused to make that docket available to me, and today he had the audacity to stand up in this House and withdraw the offer that was made quite openly in this Parliament last Thursday. The Minister has misled the House. He has indicated, and made accusations, that I supported the closure, along with other members of Parliament.

The SPEAKER: Order! Before I allow the honourable member for Heysen to proceed any further, I must point out to him that he is only supposed to be explaining to the House his defiance of the Chair, not debating any other matters, and that the range of material that he can cover is extremely limited indeed in this particular matter. The honourable member for Heysen.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: I would suggest that in relation to what I am trying to do the defiance has come about as a result of what the Minister has had to say. I am attempting to explain to the House what the Minister has said, and that is in fact the reason why I am taking this action. Sir, on Thursday—

The SPEAKER: Order! While that may be understandable from the point of the view of the honourable member for Heysen, nevertheless, it is out of order.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: Mr Speaker, the Minister himself has led me into this situation.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Chair cannot accept that. The Chair is sympathetic inasmuch as what the honourable member for Heysen can say in these circumstances is very limited, as his explanation can only hinge directly on why, in a manner that could possibly be acceptable to the House, he defied the authority of the Chair.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: On a point of order, Mr Speaker, the member for Heysen is seeking to explain why he was not prepared to withdraw. The whole point of the explanation is the reason for his refusal to withdraw the use of a word—which is deemed or has been deemed to be unparliamentary. The only way that the honourable member can explain why he refused to withdraw that is to explain the circumstances in which he used the word. Any other interpretation simply defies logic. To my way of thinking he is explaining why he will not withdraw the use of that word: he believes that that word was the only appropriate word in these circumstances.

The SPEAKER: I repeat again that I am personally sympathetic to the quandary in which the member for Heysen has placed himself by defying the Chair. I point out to the House—and I cannot verify this exactly without access immediately to the *Hansard* record—that I recall that I gave one, and possibly two, further opportunities to the member for Heysen to withdraw the word. What is under question is why he continued to defy the authority of the Chair. The honourable member for Heysen.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: The reason that I have continued to do that is that the Minister quite openly has reflected on my integrity, and I believe that this is the only way that I have to explain the situation—a situation where the Minister has been prepared to provide a lot more to the general public on this matter than he has been prepared to provide either to me as a member of this Parliament or to this House. My integrity is at stake. Accusations have been made repeatedly by the Minister that I publicly came out against the retention of the Bridgewater service. I denied that last Thursday, I deny it again and have denied it since

that time through the media, but the Minister continues to make those statements and those accusations.

The SPEAKER: Order! Regrettably, except for the initial sentence or two of that contribution, the honourable member was out of order. I cannot allow him to continue in this vein, canvassing matters other than his direct defiance of the Chair. The honourable Deputy Leader of the Opposition has a point of order?

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: I seek an explanation of your ruling on this point of order, Sir. Are you suggesting that the member for Heysen is unable to explain why he defied the Chair? That is what the explanation is about, to my mind. Are you saying, Sir, that he cannot explain why he defied you? His explanation is for that very circumstance and he is now making perfectly plain why he defied the Chair.

The SPEAKER: The Chair advised the House that I was personally sympathetic to the fact that the member for Heysen had placed himself in this quandary. I do not want to put myself in the position of having to make the explanation speech for the member for Heysen, but there is very little that the honourable member can say in these circumstances. The honourable member for Light.

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: Do you honestly believe, Sir, that you would be capable of making a speech on behalf of another person who has been aggrieved?

The SPEAKER: The Chair is merely trying to point out that in circumstances such as this there is very little that can be said that does not get into the area of canvassing matters other than the simple defiance of the Chair.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Has the honourable member for Heysen concluded his explanation?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I call the honourable member for Mawson to order.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: I can only repeat what I said previously: the Minister of Transport has reflected on my integrity, which is something I respect very strongly indeed, and he has made accusations that are grossly untrue. I have not had an opportunity to convince the Minister that those accusations are untrue, and he has continued to make those accusations. So far as I am concerned, my integrity as a member of this House is more important than anything else.

The SPEAKER: The honourable member for Light.

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK (Light): I move:

That the honourable member's explanation be agreed to.

The SPEAKER: Is the motion seconded?

Honourable members: Yes.

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: The honourable member for Heysen has clearly indicated in his explanation to the House that he was goaded into an intolerable position by a persistence—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: The mouth—

The SPEAKER: Order! I ask members on both sides of the House not to further inflame the situation. The honourable member for Light.

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: The honourable member has indicated that he was goaded into this position as a result of a ministerial statement and answers given to a series of questions today wherein statements made were completely at variance with statements (and particularly the offer) made on Thursday of last week that he and any other member would have an opportunity to look at the document mentioned. In a series of attempts to obtain access to that document he has been denied. I believe that he has ably

demonstrated to the House that his position and his integrity have been called seriously into doubt. He has taken the only course of action available to him, but that, regrettably (and he expressed his regret in his own way), has forced him into a position of defying a command from the Chair. It is on that basis that I believe the House should accept my motion and give him the benefit of the doubt.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD (Minister of State Development and Technology): I oppose the motion, and in so doing indicate that there are two clear grounds where opposition to this motion is entirely justified. First, it is quite clear that the member for Heysen has defied your authority as Speaker and it is the tradition of this House that when defiance takes place a penalty should be imposed. Your naming of the honourable member is just penalty for that defiance. That is a parliamentary tradition, not just of this session's standing, but one going back a long time, as any member of this House would know. In any event, the honourable member for Heysen has accused the Minister of Transport of lying—an unparliamentary word, in any event, and something that does not bear out in terms—

Mr LEWIS: I rise on a point of order. The word 'lying' as used by the Minister was used in a descriptive context in exactly the same way as I used the word not 10 minutes ago. I was forced to withdraw it. I regret having to use that word again, in this instance to illustrate that the Minister has used it and you have allowed it to remain on the record. I ask that you insist that he withdraw it. If a word is unparliamentary it may not be used as a verb, noun, adjective or adverb.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! There is a clear distinction between a member using that unparliamentary word in relation to another member in accusing another member of lying, which is what the honourable member for Murray-Mallee erred in doing, and the use made by the Minister of State Development and Technology when he was simply quoting what another member has done in erroneously using that unparliamentary term against another member. There is no point of order. The honourable Minister.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: The point at issue here relates to concerns raised by the member for Heysen with respect to statements by the Minister of Transport. I ask honourable members to clearly read the *Hansard* record of last Thursday's proceedings to see what reference was made by the Minister of Transport to the members concerned. There is one single reference made in the *Hansard* extract available to me, which I believe to be a true and correct record of that occasion. That report contains the following in one sentence:

It so happens that I have a record of a meeting held on 28 November 1984 at which Messrs Evans, Wotton, and (I am certain) Dean Brown were present.

No further part of that *Hansard* record contained any reference to those members. The Minister's statement was that they were present at the meeting from which recommendations came—not a statement as to which way those members enacted themselves with respect to any recommendations that came from the meeting. If in fact the *Hansard* record had said that the recommendations were supported unanimously, or were supported *nem. con.* then it would be reasonable to believe that the Minister was making a presumption about the way in which those members acted in respect of those recommendations, but nowhere in that *Hansard* record is any reference made to the way in which the present members for Heysen and Davenport and a former member of this place acted on those recommendations.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable Minister is making the same error as the honourable member for Heysen made a moment ago in straying from the substance of the debate, which is the defiance of the Chair.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: That is the point: I believe that the Minister has indicated the action that he took in this matter. He indicated that there was a breach of trust as a result of the misuse of information supplied during Question Time.

The SPEAKER: Order! I remind the honourable Minister that we are not debating any action of the Minister: we are debating whether or not the explanation given by the honourable member for Heysen for his defiance of the Chair should be accepted by his colleagues. The honourable Minister.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: I apologise for transgression of your instructions on this matter, Mr Speaker, and I may say that in fact that brings us down to what this issue is all about: the parliamentary tradition with respect to the use of certain words or non-use of certain words in this place, point one, and it is clear that there is a parliamentary tradition that the word in question should not be used and, if it is used, shall be withdrawn. The second point is that in this House it is not only a tradition, but it is in the proceedings of this House that the Speaker, when issuing instructions, shall be obeyed by members of this place and shall not be defied. If the Speaker is so defied, there shall be penalty for that, and that penalty rests in your hands as Speaker.

You, Sir, have put that penalty on the member for Heysen by naming him, and it is that issue that we are now debating. I believe there is no other possible course of action than for us to oppose the motion of the member for Light that the explanation be accepted, because there has been no evidence provided that you have not been defied or that the word should not have been withdrawn in accordance with parliamentary tradition.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: On a point of order, Mr Speaker, we can have as many speakers as one likes on this?

The SPEAKER: As many as are required.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): I certainly rise to support acceptance of the explanation given by the member for Heysen. The honourable member had been provoked beyond endurance by the arrogance of the Minister—which is typical of this Government.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: We see more of the arrogance of the Minister now, as he seeks to laugh it off in this apish fashion which he adopts from time to time, but the fact is that we have had a classic example of misrepresentation, of denigration and vilification of members on this side of the Parliament by a particularly arrogant Minister of the Crown.

If the Minister of State Development and Technology had read a bit further from the quotation he was giving to the House to sustain his point, he would have read a bit more of what the Minister said on Thursday, which was this:

Here again, members opposite are very selective, and their historical perspective is very weak or their memory is defective.

The clear implication, when they were protesting that they were not supporting the closure of this railway line, is that, in fact, they had. He went on to say—

An honourable member: That's right: no doubt about that.

The SPEAKER: Order! The Deputy Leader will resume his seat for just a moment. I had to call the member for Heysen to order for straying from the subject of the debate, which is the defiance of the Chair—

The Hon. D.C. Wotton: I have not been speaking.

The SPEAKER: Order! I also had to twice call the Minister to order for straying from the subject of the debate by introducing material relating to actions or otherwise of the Minister, and I now have to do the same for the Deputy Leader of the Opposition. The subject under debate is the naming, for defiance of the Chair, of the honourable member for Heysen. Although it is associated with that debate, we are not debating his use of the unparliamentary term 'lie'; we are debating his being named by the Chair after refusing to withdraw that word. The honourable Deputy Leader.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: With respect, Mr Speaker, we are debating that the honourable member's explanation be accepted. We are not debating anything about defiance of the Chair at the moment; we are debating the plain motion that the honourable member's explanation be accepted. I cannot be any plainer in my remarks to you, Sir, or to this House as to why the honourable member's explanation should be accepted, because the honourable Minister has defamed him, and his response to that defamation has been to defy you.

It is as plain as the nose on your face, Sir; it is as plain as a pikestaff—although your nose is not quite that long—that what I am saying is precisely relevant to the motion that the honourable member's explanation be accepted, because he has been defamed by the Minister—nothing more, nothing less. He, in fact, has called the member for Heysen a liar by implication. In parliamentary terms he has called the member for Heysen and the member for Davenport liars—that is what he has called them. He has defamed them.

He got up in this flippant, jocular fashion of his to try to laugh this off but, in the process, he got up and called them liars—and he broke clear undertakings he gave to the House on Thursday. Let me complete the quotation started by the Minister of State Development and Technology. He said:

I suggest to the member for Heysen that it would be in his best interests not to have the document tabled.

It would have been on the desk in a flash if there had been any veracity in that statement. The Minister would have dropped it there pronto if there would have been any embarrassment to the Opposition. We are not that naive. But he said this:

I am happy to let any member, including the member for Heysen, have a copy of the document, although there is no joy for the honourable member in that document.

Not half!

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: Who is kidding whom, Mr Speaker? The member for Heysen went across the Chamber and asked—

The SPEAKER: Order! I ask the Deputy Leader to resume his seat. This is all very interesting, but it is out of order. Matters being canvassed by the honourable member may well be given by way of a personal explanation, and I have been approached for personal explanations by the member for Davenport, the member for Heysen, and the honourable Minister of Transport. They could be dealt with by way of some sort of substantive motion, or they could be dealt with in a grievance debate. They are not part of the debate on why the honourable member's explanation for defiance of the Chair should be accepted. The honourable Deputy Leader.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: I do not particularly want to disagree with your ruling again, Mr Speaker. Last time I tried, you would not even put it. But the fact is that what I am saying—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: I got heaved out because the Chair would not even accept a legitimate resolution. Who makes up the rules in here: that green book, or do we make them up as we go along?

Members interjecting:

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: The arrogance of this Government makes them up as we go along. It is the most arrogant Government I have ever seen in action in this place.

The SPEAKER: Order! Order!

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: With respect, Mr Speaker, I believe that if we are debating the substantive motion—and it is a motion—that the honourable member's explanation be accepted, if we cannot examine the circumstances which led to this situation, any explanation would be plain nonsense. It would make the putting of this motion to the House and speaking to it an absurd exercise if we could not refer to the circumstances which, I believe, lead to a proper consideration of this matter and would lead us to the conclusion that the member's explanation should be accepted.

How on earth will we come to a conclusion on this motion if we cannot debate the circumstances surrounding the situation? That is what I am seeking to do: to explain the provocation, the defamation and the behaviour of the Minister which has led us to this sorry situation. Are you suggesting, Sir, that I cannot debate those matters?

The SPEAKER: Yes.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: Well, you are a bigger fool than I thought you were, Sir.

The SPEAKER: Order! I name the honourable Deputy Leader of the Opposition.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: Can one not express a view in this place? For heaven's sake! Are we in Nazi Germany or somewhere? Blimey Charlie!

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: This is incredible.

An honourable member: Absolutely extraordinary!

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: Incredible! We cannot even put a dissent—

The SPEAKER: If the Chair could just ask the House to maintain some sort of order for a few moments—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I will give the Deputy Leader of the Opposition an opportunity to withdraw that remark so that I will then withdraw my naming of him.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: What—

The SPEAKER: The extremely derogatory reference to the Chair.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: What was it?

An honourable member: You know.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: I ask what I am asked to withdraw. I ask you to tell me what words you want me to withdraw, Sir, and I will probably be quite happy to withdraw them. I would like to know precisely what you think I said which has offended you.

The SPEAKER: Order! The words used by the honourable Deputy Leader of the Opposition are words that would be offensive to any of the incumbents of this Chair over the past 130 years. The Deputy Leader used words along the lines of 'Then you're a bigger fool than I thought you

were.' I think it would be very, very difficult in the history of this Parliament to find a more derogatory reference made by a member of the House of Assembly towards the incumbent of the Chair, and I believe that I am being extremely tolerant to even offer the opportunity to the honourable Deputy Leader of the Opposition to withdraw those words.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: Well, I withdraw the words. I express regret that one cannot express one's views here freely, but I withdraw the words.

The SPEAKER: Order! In response to the last remark from the Deputy Leader of the Opposition, I will repeat that many of the points that the Deputy Leader and the members for Light and Heysen have wished to canvass can be canvassed under other opportunities within the Parliament. It is possible, if they word their personal explanations very, very subtly, that some of the points members of this House wish to raise could be expressed in personal explanations.

Members can move substantive motions in the House regarding the Minister of Transport if they wish to do so, or they can express those points of view by way of grievance debates on the adjournment or under other parts of our parliamentary procedures. But, unfortunately, what can be said by way of explaining the defiance of the Chair is extremely limited. I remind members once again that we are not debating whether or not the honourable member for Heysen should have used the unparliamentary word 'lie': we are debating acceptance of his explanation of his defying the Chair subsequent to being requested to withdraw that remark. The honourable Deputy Leader of the Opposition.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: I do not think that you, Sir, sat me down. I was making a speech which I thought was highly relevant to the circumstances surrounding—

Ms Gayler interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I ask the member for Newland not to interject.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: Thank you, Mr Speaker. I would like some further clarification, because it is far from clear to me. On a point of order, before I resume my speech, I want to be perfectly clear what is admissible in this debate and what is not. You, Sir, in giving us guidance, have said that we could make a personal explanation. I do not see how I or the member for Light could make a personal explanation and canvass the matters I am seeking to canvass in this substantive motion about the behaviour of the Minister. I did not claim to be personally defamed, nor did the member for Light. It seems completely inappropriate for me to seek to make a point of order to raise the matters that I am seeking to canvass.

However, the motion before the House is that the explanation of the member for Heysen be accepted. I believe it should be accepted because of the circumstances in which he defied the Chair. Are you suggesting in your ruling, Sir, that I cannot canvass that material? It makes a nonsense of the whole process if one cannot talk about why the honourable member defied the Chair.

The SPEAKER: Order! The Deputy Leader is able to do so within very limited constraints, which are somewhat hard to define. However, it is clear, when the honourable member or any other honourable member starts to debate at length the actions or otherwise of the Minister, that they are beginning to stray from the immediate circumstances of the offence.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: I will try to tread that very fine line in concluding my remarks. Indeed, it is a tightrope.

Mr LEWIS: I wish now to have further clarification of the events leading up to the points of order taken and the explanations given over the past seven minutes. When a member is making a speech to this House, albeit addressed on all occasions through the Chair to other members, is it legitimate for you, Sir, to interject, or for any other Speaker to interject, for that matter?

The SPEAKER: Will the honourable member further explain his point of order?

Mr LEWIS: Yes. The Deputy Leader asked the House through you, Sir, the rhetorical question, in effect, 'Cannot the substantive parts of the remarks made by the member for Heysen, in giving his explanation to the House as to why he defied your ruling, be canvassed in debate?' You, Sir, interjected 'No'. I ask you, Sir, whether you are out of order in interjecting.

The SPEAKER: A considerable amount of verbiage has transpired in the last half hour or so. My recollection of that incident may not be as precise as that of the member for Murray-Mallee. If his recollection of events is exactly correct and if the Chair did interject in those circumstances, the Chair was out of order to have done so as would any other member have been out of order in interjecting. The honourable Deputy Leader of the Opposition.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: I will desist from reading the *Hansard* transcript which was what led you, Sir, to pulling me up as you do not believe it is relevant to the naming of the member for Heysen. Suffice to say that the Minister not only defamed the member for Heysen and the member for Davenport, as well as a former member of this House, but then gave some undertakings to those members in relation to making available a docket which he subsequently has not done. A clear unequivocal offer was made to all members of this House to view the evidence on which he made these defamatory statements. We have then had the fishy circumstances surrounding the disappearance—pronto—from this place on Thursday afternoon, back to his ministerial office, of the docket which he denied was official.

That stretches the bounds of credibility. We have a document from which the Minister quotes and which he offers to make available to members of this place. The member for Heysen went across the Chamber to the Minister but was precluded from viewing the document as a question was being asked behind the Minister. I fully expected the Minister to give it to him but he did not. The Minister apparently expected the honourable member to read it upside down while a question was being asked, so the member for Heysen returned to his seat. On seeking the document at the first opportunity, it had mysteriously disappeared back to the department.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable Deputy Leader will resume his seat. While I realise that the Deputy Leader is in a difficult position in making his contribution, the events that can be canvassed can only be those immediately preceding the naming of the member for Heysen. The honourable Deputy Leader.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: The member for Davenport was making this point immediately prior to this occurring. The fact is that the promise was made and has been broken, and the Minister will not make the document available. Far be it from the implication that the Minister sought to noise abroad that it would be embarrassing to the member for Heysen—it is obviously embarrassing the Minister.

I conclude by saying that it is another classic example of the arrogance and contempt of Parliament that we see so

frequently from members of the Government. Day in and day out we see displays of this arrogance—the non-answering of legitimate questions, the hedging, the tightrope walking, the tap dancing—and here we see the Minister defaming members, giving undertakings and then breaching them when there is not a skerrick of truth in the accusations he has made. That put an intolerable strain on the honourable member, who, as he pointed out to the House, puts a premium on his integrity above anything else in this place. He clearly believes that the Minister lied and, under those circumstances, if he believes the Minister has lied and impugned his integrity, I can fully understand his not being willing to withdraw a half-voice interjection which you, Sir, did not even hear. It was a half-voice interjection which many members of this House did not even hear.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: The fact is that the Speaker did not hear the interjection. I recall, Mr Speaker, when you said that you could not give a ruling because you could not hear, as there was too much noise. I recall your saying to the House, 'I am afraid that I cannot rule. I will just have to let the honourable member go on to see what he is saying, because there was too much noise in the Chamber.' On this occasion, the member for Heysen has been pulled up, and under these intolerable circumstances he has now been named. I believe that his explanation should be accepted. Indeed, the situation in which he finds himself is impossible. Here we have a Minister who, in effect, publicly calls the honourable member a liar. When a Minister promises to make certain documents available to the honourable member and subsequently does not do so, it makes a complete farce of this Chamber and, more than anything else, illustrates the arrogance of this Government and of this Minister on this occasion.

Mr S.G. EVANS (Davenport): I support the motion that the explanation of the member for Heysen be accepted. This House has the power, under Standing Orders, to accept the honourable member's explanation. In exceptional circumstances this can be done. Indeed, that was the reason why the provision was included in Standing Orders. If it was intended that an apology or explanation should never be accepted by the House, with the Government using its numbers, such a provision would never have been included in Standing Orders to allow for an explanation to be accepted.

The member for Heysen has given an explanation, and another member has moved that that explanation be accepted. We are now being given the opportunity to decide whether there is a need to drift away from what is written in another Standing Order. An example of that is Standing Order 125, which provides:

In answering any such question a member shall not debate the matter to which the same refers.

Members bend that rule daily. That Standing Order is clearly written, without doubt, but practice shows that it is possible not merely to debate a question but to raise a subject matter on a different topic and debate that. That is done regularly, so it appears that commonsense is used in this place in certain circumstances. My mother once said that that was the most uncommon thing in the human race and that may well be accurate and proven here today.

The member for Heysen has been placed in an impossible situation, as indeed I have. The Minister has come into the House today with an explanation different from that which he gave us Thursday, and that proves that it was an untruth last Thursday. The member for Heysen chose to use the other word instead of 'untruth'. He did that because he has

been subject to a vicious attack on a person who has fought to retain a service for the community. Indeed, the impossible statement made by the Minister today clearly shows that. Those such as the member for Heysen who were at the meeting know that some people left early because the election was to be held on the following Saturday. Indeed, I did not stay for the duration of the meeting.

The SPEAKER: Order! The initial remarks of the honourable member for Davenport were among those of contributors to this debate that have been most closely related to the matter that is supposed to be under debate, namely, the acceptance of the explanation given by the honourable member for Heysen. However, he has now fallen into the error of other members on both sides of straying into other matters. He can only proceed as he originally proceeded, such as with the general philosophy of the Standing Order, with whether the honourable member's acceptance should be received, or with matters related to circumstances immediately prior to the naming of the honourable member, or to other explanations or excuses that could be made in support of the honourable member, such as ill health or whatever. However, the honourable member for Davenport cannot, any more than any other member, deal with any other matter such as the action of the Minister.

Mr S.G. EVANS: Thank you, Mr Speaker. I do not wish to delay the House any longer. I do not know whether ill health enters into this matter, although sickness of mind may be involved, judging from the Minister's statements last week and today. The honourable member is hurt, as I have been hurt, over this. The honourable member has given an explanation of why he used the word that he did use. We all understand that and we have the opportunity to use our discretion and commonsense and say that he has been goaded into using the word. We all understand that Standing Orders give us the opportunity to accept his explanation. The honourable member has given that explanation, and I ask members to forget about Party politics and the numbers game and to support the motion that the explanation be accepted.

The SPEAKER: Before calling on the honourable member for Light, I remind members that, if he speaks, he closes the debate.

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK (Light): I have previously requested that members consider the adequacy of the information given by the member for Heysen, and I do so again. I draw to the attention of the House the double effect of the wrong decision being taken at this stage. Not only would the honourable member for Heysen be denied the opportunity of continuing in this place for the rest of the day: he would also be denied the opportunity of making a personal explanation on a subject that has become vital to the whole of this afternoon's proceedings, not only during Question Time but subsequently.

It is inevitable that to take the action contemplated by the Government and by the recommendation that has been made to Government members and to this House by the Minister of State Development and Technology is to ensure that this matter will surface again tomorrow. I therefore ask members to give due consideration to the importance of the decision that they are about to make.

The House divided on the motion:

Ayes (14)—Messrs Allison, P.B. Arnold, S.J. Baker, Becker, Eastick (teller), S.G. Evans, Goldsworthy, Gunn, Ingerson, Lewis, Meier, Olsen, Oswald, and Wotton.

Noes (26)—Mr Abbott, Mrs Appleby, Messrs L.M.F. Arnold (teller), Bannon, Blevins, Crafter, De Laine, Dui-gan, and Ferguson, Ms Gayler, Messrs Gregory, Groom,

Hamilton, Hemmings, Hopgood, Keneally, and Klunder, Ms Lenehan, Messrs McRae, Mayes, Payne, Plunkett, Rann, Robertson, Slater, and Tyler.

Pair—Aye—Ms Cashmore. No—Mr M.J. Evans.

Majority of 12 for the Noes.

Motion thus negated.

The SPEAKER: Order! The explanation of the honourable member for Heysen not having been accepted by the House, I must now ask that he withdraw from the Chamber.

The honourable member for Heysen having withdrawn from the Chamber:

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I call the Minister of Housing and Construction to order!

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD (Minister of State Development and Technology): I move:

That the member for Heysen be suspended from the service of the House.

The SPEAKER: Is the Deputy Leader of the Opposition taking a point of order? That matter is not debatable.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Hanson has a point of order.

Mr BECKER: I seek clarification as to the duration of the suspension.

The SPEAKER: The Standing Orders spell out clearly the degree of suspension, and they do not have to be spelt out by the honourable member who moves that resolution. Members will find the provision in the second paragraph of Standing Order 171.

The House divided on the motion:

Ayes (25)—Mr Abbott, Mrs Appleby, Messrs L.M.F. Arnold (teller), Blevins, Crafter, De Laine, Duigan, and Ferguson, Ms Gayler, Messrs Gregory, Groom, Hamilton, Hemmings, Hopgood, Keneally, and Klunder, Ms Lenehan, Messrs McRae, Mayes, Payne, Plunkett, Rann, Robertson, Slater, and Tyler.

Noes (13)—Messrs Allison, P.B. Arnold, S.J. Baker, Becker, Eastick, S.G. Evans, Goldsworthy (teller), Gunn, Ingerson, Lewis, Meier, Olsen, and Oswald.

Pairs—Ayes—Messrs Bannon and M.J. Evans. Noes—Mr Chapman and Ms Cashmore.

Majority of 12 for the Ayes.

Motion thus carried.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION: BELAIR-BRIDGEWATER RAIL SERVICE

Mr S.G. EVANS (Davenport): I seek leave to complete my explanation.

Leave granted.

Mr S.G. EVANS: I am angered over the whole incident because I went on that committee to give an input, and at no time did I try to convince anybody in the community. The Minister said in this House that five points were agreed upon: that did not occur and it was never put to a vote. The only general conclusion was that the rail service had to continue. Either Mr Keneally or his adviser (Mr Heath) has lied, and I say that quite clearly: one of them has lied.

I say that the Minister came into this House today with a different explanation to that which he gave last week. He said that he read the detail on the weekend, and it is different to that which he gave last week. He knows that either last week was a lie or this week was a lie, and that has to be the case. For me the Minister has misled and lied to the House. I stand by that statement: I hope not to be a hypocrite, because I agree with what the member for Hey-

sen said and I repeat it: the Minister has acted in such a way in this Parliament, and therefore he must be a liar.

The SPEAKER: Order! The last remark by the honourable member for Davenport confirmed what I thought I overheard him say about half a minute before relating to the use of unparliamentary language. I ask the member for Davenport to withdraw that unparliamentary term.

Mr S.G. EVANS: I am placed in the same situation as was the member for Heysen. I supported his action. I have been here nearly 20 years, and I have never been warned over that period. I regret that I am unable to bow to your request, Sir. That hurts me also, but not as much as the Minister's action has in relation to this issue.

The SPEAKER: Order! Does the Chair correctly interpret that as being a refusal to withdraw the unparliamentary term?

Mr S.G. EVANS: Yes, Sir.

The SPEAKER: In that case the Chair has no alternative but to name the honourable member for Davenport.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. E.R. Goldsworthy: You might think it is funny, but—

The SPEAKER: Order! I ask the Deputy Leader of the Opposition to ignore any interjections that I may have overlooked, and I ask Government members not to further inflame the situation with any interjections. Does the honourable member for Davenport wish to make an explanation of why he should be permitted to defy the Chair?

Mr S.G. EVANS: I do. In doing that, I want to say to other members of the House that I do not want a resolution accepting my explanation because that is a waste of time: we know the end result; it is a numbers game. I will be brief.

Last week I gave a personal explanation, hoping that the Minister would read it on the weekend and come back and apologise. He had that opportunity; he did not do it. So, I apologise for the unparliamentary term. I accept that it is against Standing Orders. I was the Whip for 15 years, and I fought against other people using such terms. It hurts me to do what I have done today, but I am doing it because I believe that I owe it to those people who supported me through the fight on that committee. I am absolutely disgusted with the way it has come about, but I have no alternative. I am not asking anyone to accept the explanation—but I have given the reason why I have done it, and it is the truth.

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK (Light): I am fully appreciative of the request that has been made by the member for Davenport that no acceptance of his explanation be received. However, it would be completely against the best principles of this House if that action was not taken on his behalf, and I formally move that his explanation be received.

The SPEAKER: Is that motion seconded?

Opposition members: Yes, Sir.

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: I believe that the member for Davenport has outlined his position very clearly and rationally, without any attempt to misrepresent to this House any aspect of the issue as it applies to him or indeed as it applies to any members on this side of the House. If the Government wishes to persist in not accepting this explanation, then be it on the Government's head that it wants this Parliament to become a rubber stamp of any action which is taken by a Minister of the Crown, whether knowingly or unknowingly caught out, and which seeks to save his own skin at the expense of another member of the House. I believe that today in relation to this matter we have seen an action taken by the Minister of Transport that cannot

be sustained as being a proper action of a Minister of the Crown.

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Light is digressing from what is the appropriate subject matter of this debate, as I tried to spell out earlier in the course of another debate.

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: I believe that I was demonstrating the validity of the explanation made by the member for Davenport, and the circumstances in which he finds that he is unable to give any explanation to the House other than that which he gave.

Mr LEWIS (Murray-Mallee): I want to add my support to that proposition, and not on this occasion to the exclusion of consideration of what occurred on the previous occasion earlier today following which the member for Heysen was suspended from service to the House. On this occasion I put, as I would have put previously had I not been obscured from your view, Mr Speaker, before the member for Light rose to close the debate, those points which I would have made then. The points are quite simple. All members are capable of human frailty. You, Sir, have illustrated that by your own admission today. The Minister of Transport is included in that. This is a Parliament, and you are its Presiding Officer in this Chamber. It is comprised of people elected to represent people and, accordingly, if we expect the rest of the community—that is the community extant of this House—when they know that their word is being relied upon as the truth then we ourselves should behave in the same way, and that includes the Minister. You, Sir, were good enough, honourable and honest enough, to admit that you may have erred, and indeed did, when you interjected on the honourable Deputy Leader.

However, the Minister is not good enough, honourable, or reasonable enough to admit to his frailties, when he deliberately misleads this place, contradicts himself and, after having given this place undertakings in good faith as Minister of the Crown, to be accepted at least by other members in good faith, to then denounce and retract that undertaking without removing from his action the way in which he has besmirched the reputations of other honourable members or indeed citizens not here in this place. The Minister knows that; the member for Heysen knows it; and the member for Davenport knows it.

However, the member for Davenport, as is the member for Heysen, is honourable. They acknowledged that they acted in an unparliamentary way. The member for Heysen admitted it, even though you did not hear it. It seems to me that if we are to expect those standards of other people outside this place, and indeed if we believe in those standards as being relevant and necessary in this place, then in all honesty and in all conscience we should accept the explanation of the member for Davenport, because it was in protection of his honour that he indeed made the accusation and used the unparliamentary term to succinctly describe the behaviour and the assertions made by the Minister.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD (Minister of State Development and Technology): I do not support the resolution to accept the explanation of the member for Davenport. It is quite clear what the member for Davenport has done this afternoon. He has used a word which is unparliamentary. Indeed, in the space of 60 seconds he used it three times and in three different forms—both as a verb and in two forms of a noun. He did this shortly after a similar event following which another member was suspended by this House. The member for Murray-Mallee might be attempting

to talk about the frailty of humankind, but I can say that it is quite clear that the member for Davenport has committed an act of calculated defiance on this matter, because already this afternoon we have had significant debate about whether or not such a word should have been used in this place. We also have a tradition, which the member for Davenport, as a member of this place for 20 years, should be aware of and, furthermore, he was offered the opportunity by you, Mr Speaker, to withdraw that—and he knowingly chose not to do so.

In that context, if this House were to accept his explanation and therefore not suspend him from the service of the House, we would be saying that the traditions of this House are not worth anything. We would be contradicting the actions that we have previously undertaken as a House. In fact we would be defying the authority of the Chair, and we would therefore be abetting disruption in this place, and I would argue that that could not be tolerated. It may be, as the member for Davenport argued earlier this afternoon, that there are occasions (hence the very existence in the Standing Orders of a motion to accept an explanation) where it might be appropriate to do so. I do not believe we have seen any of that this afternoon, and we certainly do not see it on this occasion when this act—not an act of spontaneous frailty but rather an act of calculated defiance has been perpetrated. I therefore ask members not to support or accept the explanation.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): I believe that we have got to a situation in this place whereby we either make up our minds whether we are going to tolerate evasion of the truth or whether we are going to stand up and be counted to see that we can be forthright and honest in this most public of forums. If any Government ever had a record of being evasive and of twisting the facts, it is the present Government. We have here a classic case in point. If a member believes that a Minister has lied, has been evasive, and has not told the truth—which I believe is the situation with which we are dealing here—what recourse does that member have, if the Minister persists in that attitude?

What are we in this place interested in? Are we interested in the facts? Are we interested in the truth? Or are we interested in giving plaudits for fancy footwork, evasive answers, for anything but the facts? That is the sorry situation to which we are reduced in this Parliament, I am afraid. Ministers are getting marks for not telling the facts and plaudits for being evasive and brushing aside the Opposition. We are in a pretty sorry situation when we have a Government, or Minister in this case, that is not prepared to be straightforward or to deal in the truth. If he did honestly make a mistake, he should admit it.

It is quite clear that what the Minister put to this House on Thursday was untruthful. It is perfectly plain to every member in this place, whether Labour, Liberal or cross bench member, that what the Minister said to this House on Thursday was untruthful: and, if one wants to put it in its strongest and bluntest term one uses the word that the two honourable members did, that he lied; that is what they said.

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: I rise on a point of order. It is obvious that the Deputy Leader is in contravention of Standing Orders and is using a term that has previously been ruled to be unparliamentary. I ask that he withdraw the statement that I, as Minister, have lied.

The SPEAKER: I uphold the point of order raised by the Minister of Transport. When the unparliamentary expression referred to was used by the Deputy Leader he

did not seem to be quoting but seemed to be making a direct remark regarding the Minister of his own accord, so I ask him to withdraw it.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: I withdraw and rephrase: the honourable members honestly and sincerely believed that the Minister lied and they made that clear to the House this afternoon. The Minister's fancy footwork is so typical of this Government, whose members think how smart they are by being so evasive and hiding behind commercial confidence so that they do not have to give the public the economic facts. How smart they are at brushing the Opposition off with abuse!

The SPEAKER: Order! I reluctantly point out to the honourable Deputy Leader that he is digressing again from the main topic under discussion, which is defiance of the Chair by the honourable member for Davenport. I realise that this is a difficult debate for members to restrict themselves strictly to those matters, but other members have been able to do so; for example, the member for Murray-Mallee. So I must ask the Deputy Leader to do so also.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: I do not believe that the Minister is interested in the truth. We have come to a sorry situation in this Parliament when there is no longer respect for the truth, and when we have Ministers prepared, as the honourable member for Light has said, to save their skins by defaming other people in this place, because that is what has happened. The member for Davenport does not lightly leave this Chamber; as he has said, he has been here longer than anybody else.

Mr LEWIS: I rise on a point of order. Is it in order for the Deputy Premier to lean over the rail of the Chamber and address members of the public in the Gallery with his back turned to you, Mr Speaker?

The SPEAKER: I take the point of order raised by the member for Murray-Mallee. It is quite out of order and I ask the Deputy Premier to not do so. I did not observe this myself, but it is quite out of order, and I ask the Deputy Premier to not do so. The honourable Deputy Leader.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: I conclude that politics in this State and in this country have sunk to a pretty low ebb when people are prepared to deal as this Minister has dealt with people in this sorry affair which has led to two members having their reputations dragged in the dirt: they have been besmirched—they have been misrepresented and defamed by a Minister to save his own skin because he is not prepared to deal with the facts in this place. Politics has sunk to a pretty low level in this State (and indeed, there is fair evidence that they have sunk to a low level in this country). If people are not interested in the truth in this place, then Lord help us.

The House divided on the motion:

Ayes (13)—Messrs Allison, P.B. Arnold, S.J. Baker, Becker, Eastick (teller), S.G. Evans, Goldsworthy, Gunn, Ingerson, Lewis, Meier, Olsen, and Oswald.

Noes (25)—Mr Abbott, Mrs Appleby, Messrs L.M.F. Arnold (teller), Blevins, Crafter, De Laine, Duigan, and Ferguson, Ms Gayler, Messrs Gregory, Groom, Hamilton, Hemmings, Hopgood, Keneally, and Klunder, Ms Lenehan, Messrs McRae, Mayes, Payne, Plunkett, Rann, Robertson, Slater, and Tyler.

Pairs—Ayes—Ms Cashmore and Mr Chapman. Noes—Messrs Bannon and M.J. Evans.

Majority of 12 for the Noes.

Motion thus negatived.

The SPEAKER: I must ask the member for Davenport to withdraw.

The honourable member for Davenport having withdrawn from the Chamber:

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD (Minister of State Development and Technology) I moved:

That the honourable member for Davenport be suspended from the service of the House for the remainder of today's sitting.

Motion carried.

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

The SPEAKER: Leave is sought. Is leave granted?

Honourable members: No.

The SPEAKER: Leave is not granted.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: On a point of order, Mr Speaker, is it correct for a Minister to threaten other members of the House?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I call the member for Goyder to order.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I again call the member for Goyder to order. Could the member for Light further explain his point of order?

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: The Minister of Transport indicated very clearly to members on this side of the House, 'We will remember,' having been denied the opportunity—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I ask Government backbenchers to come to order.

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: —having been denied the opportunity—

The SPEAKER: I ask the Minister of Transport to come to order. The honourable member for Light.

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: —to gain leave. The member for Heysen has been denied leave to give a personal explanation. There have been plenty of indications this afternoon that nobody wants to hear members who can effectively—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Light has made his point of order quite clear. I cannot accept that that is a point of order. If the honourable Minister interjected 'We will remember,' that in itself is disorderly as an interjection but, other than that, I cannot accept the point of order of the member for Light.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I call the House to order. I warn the member for Hayward and the member for Morphet.

SESSIONAL COMMITTEES

The Legislative Council notified its appointment of sessional committees.

The SPEAKER: Call on the business of the day.

ADDRESS IN REPLY

Adjourned debate on motion for adoption.
(Continued from 6 August. Page 36.)

Mr TYLER (Fisher): In seconding the member for Adelaide's excellent Address in Reply motion, I would like to congratulate His Excellency on a speech that lays down a charter for continued sound economic management and strong leadership for our great State. I would like take this opportunity to talk about some of the recent developments in South Australia. I will also address some of the changes that have occurred in my electorate and how such things

affect the provision of human services to the residents of my area.

The Fisher electorate now has approximately 25 000 voters enrolled (approximately 4 000 voters or 20.8 per cent above quota). Fisher is a relatively new electorate. As members would know, its current boundaries were determined in the 1983 re-distribution. At that time it was predicted that the population would continue to increase by approximately 8 per cent per annum for a number of years. The State Electoral Commissioner, Mr Andy Becker, commenting recently on the imbalances in State electorates, noted that the rate of growth in Fisher had exceeded the commission's expectations.

I should also note, as I have in this place in the past, that Fisher has a predominantly young population, with a large proportion under the age of 40 years, and 30 per cent of the total population is under 14 years of age. Statistics such as these help demonstrate what is well known amongst the residents of the Fisher electorate; that is, that the provision of human services, while improving all the time, is not keeping pace with the rate of growth.

Given such pressing needs, Mr Speaker, you can imagine what devastation the proposals put forward by the Federal Opposition during the recent election campaign would have brought to my electorate. It is easy to offer tax cuts, but their implementation would have caused considerable difficulties for growing communities such as the one I represent. Severe cuts in Government expenditure would have a more devastating effect on the young and the elderly. Developing areas such as mine, with an emphasis on families, would have been dealt a savage blow. Following the May economic statement and the subsequent Premiers Conference, it is already difficult enough for the State Government to keep up with the needs of areas such as Fisher in education, public transport, road construction and maintenance, child-care, and health services. With the cuts that Mr Howard was proposing it would have been impossible.

Existing State Government funded services would have had their costs dramatically increased. New services such as the child-care centre currently being constructed at the Hub, and the realignment of Reservoir Drive (now called Happy Valley Drive) simply would not have been provided, and jobs would have been lost—valuable jobs providing valuable services to the people of my electorate.

If Mr Howard were the Prime Minister today, I wonder how many more children would have to be crammed into State school classrooms; how many more teachers would the Opposition be asking us to sack; how many more nurses would we have to manage without; and how many more people would remain on the Housing Trust's waiting list for longer and longer because of cutbacks to public housing? How many more people would there be on the unemployment queues? Fortunately, the Australian electorate had the good sense to ensure that this did not happen. I am confident that the people of this State and of my electorate will benefit from that decision during the next three years.

Nonetheless, there will have to be some sensible and fair changes made to ensure that the State is able to meet the demands placed on it by the Federal Government while still retaining reasonable human services. I will expand further on this subject a little later, Mr Speaker, but first I would like to make a few general comments about the bicentenary celebrations that will occur in Australia next year—and I suppose my comments will not please some. However, I do have strong feelings on the subject, and I believe it is appropriate to make them known in this Chamber.

The Bicentennial Authority has been operating since 1980, and I believe there have been a number of projects that will have long lasting benefits to the community. Indeed, the Happy Valley Drive realignment in my electorate is one of those projects. However, I basically believe that the celebration has only limited appeal to most Australians. While the settlement of Sydney has considerable significance for Australia, my basic objection to the bicentenary is that it celebrates only the European colonisation at Sydney Cove. For that reason I believe the excitement of the event will be confined mainly to New South Wales.

In my opinion, its interpretation then must be that it is a celebration of a State anniversary, just as we in South Australia last year celebrated our sesquicentenary. The fervour will be lost to the vast majority of Australians and it will be merely another event to watch on TV, the importance of which will be questionable to many viewers. I do not wish to be a party pooper. That is not in my nature. Nobody enjoys a good party as much as I do. However, I find it hard to justify the bicentenary and the money that has been spent on it when I have to tell people in my electorate that services that they need are not available because of financial constraints.

Mr Speaker, I do not want you to misunderstand. My comments are made as a fiercely patriotic Australian. I am not against celebrations or having a party. I just believe that we must celebrate when it is appropriate. In my opinion, the formation of the States into the Commonwealth of Australia in 1901 is probably the most significant event in our country's history. So when it comes around for the centenary of that milestone I will be the first to celebrate, to acknowledge the achievements of our pioneers, and to reflect on what we can do to make this country an even greater place in which to live.

However, I am realistic; I know that these comments will not alter the fact that we will celebrate the bicentenary next year. Consequently, I would like to suggest that the Bicentennial Authority should reconsider the program of celebration. One of the complaints that people expressed to me about our Jubilee 150 last year was that it was drawn out over the entire year. It lost its impact as a celebration as people became indifferent to or bored with its activities. My suggestion to the authority would be to confine the activities to a two month period. I believe this would have a greater impact with most people.

As indicated earlier, I would like to take this opportunity to outline to members a more detailed look at some aspects of community and human services in my electorate. Within my electorate currently are two high schools and 16 primary schools (four of which are private). Enrolments at these schools are constantly increasing. This year over 400 more students are enrolled in the two high schools than in 1985. Similarly, many of the primary and junior primary schools have experienced increased enrolments. These increases have been particularly significant in the Aberfoyle Park and Sheidow Park primary schools. For instance, the three primary schools in Aberfoyle Park now have 300 more students than in 1985. Many of the schools in my electorate are already stretched to the limit: so much so, that the three Aberfoyle Park primary schools have found it necessary to set zones to limit new enrolments. This is an unusual step for primary schools and, I believe, demonstrates the problems we are experiencing in Fisher. With the population set to increase over the next 10 years, these resources will be stretched even further.

It is relevant that currently one third of the State's expenditure goes into the provision of education. Nonetheless, given these increases in demand, expenditure must be

maintained in order to continue the high standard of education that we have rightly come to expect for our children. Although the State-wide trend shows a reduction in the number of students attending high school, in my electorate the number is increasing. I am sure that in its funding allocations the Education Department will make allowances for these regional differences and divert funds into areas with the greatest need. As members will be aware, the State Government has identified the Happy Valley council area (which comprises a significant proportion of my electorate) as an area with a pressing need for child-care services and is responding to this need. Since 1985 two child-care centres offering subsidised places for a total of 150 children have been built within my electorate. Still, there are some problems relating to the whole range of children's services which I intend to address in a separate speech to this House.

It is also true to say that the southern suburbs of Adelaide have severe transport problems. For some time the Government has been working towards the construction of the third arterial road with the aim of easing the traffic congestion on the current thoroughfares to and from the city of Adelaide during peak times. Contrary to claims made by the member for Morphett that the Bannon Government had plans to indefinitely defer construction of the highway, work is currently going ahead as planned. One cannot help but wonder what motivated the member for Morphett to make these claims during the recent Federal election. It certainly cannot have been out of concern for his constituents' well-being, but rather to throw confusion on the whole problem of funding the major infrastructure projects like this.

Obviously, funding for this road depends to a large extent on the Federal Government. In South Australia our funding for road construction has been retarded by the Federal Government. That is a current fact of life.

Mr Lewis: Garbage!

Mr TYLER: The member for Murray-Mallee says 'Garbage!' I am referring to the May economic statement, which is a good example of what I am talking about. To pick up the matter further, the Liberal Party's policy as announced during the recent Federal election, would have made road construction programs like the third arterial road terminal.

The Bannon Government is firmly committed to the construction of this road. Just how far it will proceed in the next 12 months will depend on the budget and a consideration of the State's overall priorities. I would urge the State Government to proceed with the construction of this road as a major priority. I know that the Highways Department is continuing its investigation into the preliminary design work for the road. An environmental impact statement is well under way. The department is looking at several possible road alternatives from Darlington to Reynella on land situated between Main South Road and Lonsdale Road. The land has already been subjected to an aerial survey to obtain the ground details. An accurate map, I understand, was compiled last year by the Lands Department. On-ground surveys are being done for additional details where the new road matches into the existing road system. An analysis of traffic patterns has been also completed and will continue to be monitored. I understand that one of the challenges facing the Highways Department is developing a scheme which allows traffic to collect and disperse in an efficient way, while keeping environmental impact and cost to acceptable levels.

For most of its length through the study area, the north-south transportation corridor is relatively narrow. Work is concentrating now on evaluating each alternative, taking into account all physical and environmental factors and, of

course, cost. In the meantime, upgrading work to improve traffic flow on Main South Road at Darlington has been proceeding and will continue. This will certainly help to alleviate the problems for the time being. With the completion of the Happy Valley Drive realignment come important implications for adjoining roads. I believe a traffic control/management plan is urgently required for Flagstaff Road, Black Road and Happy Valley Drive.

I acknowledge that it is important for the Government to look at a whole range of transport problems and options in terms of realistic budget restraints. I also know that there are some important changes, such as those I have just outlined, that can be made in the short term to make the current road system safer for users. There are still a number of roads in my electorate which were designed for a semi-rural environment and are simply not adequately coping with the increased volumes of traffic. This has severe road safety implications, and I intend to raise some of these road safety problems at a later time in this place.

In spending some time in talking about private transport I would like now to spend some time looking at the vexed question of public transport. I have been concerned and have expressed my concern in this place in the past that the State Transport Authority has been operating in a piecemeal fashion. But, having said that, I should emphasise that most of this has resulted in a better bus service in my district. However, I understand that there will be some cut-backs to services that have been operating on a trial basis in my electorate and that the cut-backs are expected to come into force in late August.

Like all members of Parliament, I am fiercely parochial about my electorate and, quite frankly, I am very annoyed and disappointed that these services are going to be cut. Whilst I appreciate that the State Transport Authority is running at a deficit of about \$100 million a year and that uneconomical services that carry only a few people need to be cut, I would have hoped that the STA would carry these services a little longer. They are not earthshattering changes, but I believe they are fairly significant in the long term, considering the growing nature of my electorate. It is my belief that a community does not alter its habits overnight, and to give these services a trial period of only two years is totally inadequate. Many people have the habit of driving their own cars as a direct response to the lack of services. So, when the STA comes in and offers a new service it cannot expect the community to change its lifestyle and entrenched habits overnight.

The STA does have an educating role to play and should sell the benefits of public transport. On that note, I congratulate the Minister of Transport on his initiative in initiating the Collins report to review the performance of the State Transport Authority. The report has many redeeming recommendations, such as the establishment of a business plan. But I believe the significant recommendation is for a wide-ranging review of the demand and role of Adelaide's public transport system into the 1990s. I would urge the Government, and particularly the Minister of Transport, to quickly implement that recommendation. Such a review should consider all aspects of the transport system, including modal integration, trends in patronage, commuter attitudes and expectations, revenue policies and technology and, of course, efficiency and service demand. The review should also recommend methods which the STA should use in consulting commuters, community groups, local government bodies, unions and members of Parliament. This would enable all parties to have a better understanding of the demands and needs of providing an effective and efficient public transport system.

Although I believe that the STA has served Adelaide well in the past, I think it is time for a review of this type to take place to take our public transport system well into the 1990s and beyond. The southern suburbs have changed drastically in the past four to five years, particularly in many areas of my electorate around Happy Valley. What we have learnt from the latest census figures and the latest population surveys from the Department of Environment and Planning is that the population has grown drastically and that it is expected to continue to grow.

This throws out a tremendous challenge to local, State and Federal Governments in coming to terms with the needs of a growing population. I, more than most people, appreciate the demands and pressures that the STA is under in trying to curtail the deficit whilst also improving service delivery. However, my philosophic approach to public transport is that public transport systems, whether they be in Adelaide or worldwide, cannot be expected to operate completely on a commercial basis. I believe that a public transport system should be justified in terms of the community benefit that such a service provides, particularly in predominantly dormitory suburbs such as those in the southern metropolitan area of Adelaide.

This is especially important for people on the eastern side of the southern suburbs where there has been such a huge population increase over recent years. These are primarily dormitory areas, where more than half of the work force is employed in clerical/administrative positions or the professions. Many of these people commute daily to Adelaide for employment. In efforts to reduce traffic congestion from the south the Government and the local councils, through the Southern Region of Councils, are encouraging industry to set up in the southern region. Apart from the obvious economic and employment benefits to the southern region, it is my hope that such a move will help ease the traffic flow to the city each day. For instance, the Southern Region of Councils recently produced a business directory outlining manufacturing and service industries located in the southern region of Adelaide. One of the aims of this directory is to lure companies and employers and to make them more aware of the benefits of setting up in the south.

In launching the directory, the Minister of State Development and Technology praised the efforts of the councils in fostering economic growth, and I join with him in that praise. The Minister also mentioned the link between technology and economic growth. Indeed, members will recall my question to the Minister in April concerning the proposal of the member for Bright and me that an annex to Technology Park be built in the southern suburbs. Given the infrastructure costs, such a move would need to be a long term consideration. But that is what Labor Governments in Australia are about.

The Hon. E.R. Goldsworthy interjecting:

Mr TYLER: The Deputy Leader of the Opposition laughs, but it is a fact of life that that is what Labor Governments are about in this country: the long term consideration for the majority of Australians over and above the short term gains of a few. We all know that many of the economic problems Australia is currently experiencing could have been avoided had the Federal Governments of the 1950s and 1960s (the political colleagues of the Deputy Leader) paid more attention to Australia's long term economic future. But, sadly, that did not occur, and we now need an economic strategy that will allow Australia to control its economic future and to achieve a better balance in the economy so that our fortunes will not be subject to the whims of international commodity markets. This is the strategy that is currently in train; and it is a strategy that will enable us

Australians to make our own luck. To make this possible we will have to get back to basics. The community as a whole must seriously consider what its priorities are and concentrate on delivering those priorities. Choices will have to be made and some pet programs will have to be sacrificed in the wider interests of the community.

The Government will not be able to find the money for everything that the community wants, but we will be working towards providing everything that the community needs. We will also be working towards ensuring that the available resources are used to the best possible advantage. To this end, the Premier announced a freeze on Public Service recruitment in June this year, but this does not involve a blind slashing of departments and services. Over the next twelve months the State Government will be looking at ways of eliminating duplication. Indeed, the Bannon Government has long been in the business of providing a more effective public sector for the service of South Australians, and to this end it has kept a tight rein on the Public Service.

The Hon. E.R. Goldsworthy interjecting:

Mr TYLER: The Deputy Leader laughs again, but in a minute I will get to some of the stories that the Leader and the Deputy Leader have been putting out. In South Australia, our deficit per head in the public sector is much lower than in most other States.

The Hon. H. Allison interjecting:

Mr TYLER: If the member for Mount Gambier would bear with me for a moment, I will get to the 10 000 person figure and explain to him the deception that his Leader has been putting out over the media. Returning to the point that I was making, this restraint has not happened by accident. It has involved responsible and sometimes hard decisions on the economy. We will continue to take that approach, while maintaining existing services to the highest standard we can.

That is why, in announcing the Public Service freeze, the Premier also announced a package of measures which includes the establishment of training schemes for existing personnel, the development of voluntary retirement schemes, and the formation of a committee to undertake work force planning in the public sector. Sound measures such as these will ensure that South Australians will not be unduly disadvantaged by difficult economic circumstances.

But what does the Opposition Leader have to say (and obviously his comments are reflected in this Parliament by his colleagues) about the sound economic decisions? Instead of sneering and carrying on like the member for Mount Gambier has been doing this afternoon, along with his Deputy Leader, and rather than offering constructive suggestions the Leader of the Opposition makes a blatantly misleading statement suggesting a 10 000 person increase in the Public Service. This figure includes part-time and job-share situations, that is, he talks about the number of people rather than the number of full-time positions. The Leader also includes State Bank and SGIC employees. These are commercial enterprises. I would have thought that the Opposition would have been patting these State Government authorities on the back and saying, 'Great, you are doing a good job, you are being competitive, because the more people you employ the better it is for the State as it reflects profitability and demand.' However, the Opposition continues to peddle the story about a 10 000 person increase which, unfortunately, has been getting quite an airing of late and is all about deception.

The policies of the Bannon Government have brought some great improvements to the lot of most South Australians. A further positive development in South Australia's economy was the AA plus credit rating recently given by

the Japanese Credit Rating Agency. This achievement was the result of years of hard work by this Government and the people of South Australia. It has given us a base for the future and we now have to work hard to capitalise on that base. For instance, during 1986 our employment increased by 2.6 per cent—higher than the national rate of increase. Although unemployment in South Australia is still unacceptably high, the situation has been gradually improving. The granting of the submarine construction contracts to South Australia will certainly help in this regard.

Finally, I take this opportunity to congratulate Premier Bannon and Mr Jim Duncan and the staff of the Submarine Task Force on their efforts in securing these important contracts for South Australia. I know that some members of the Liberal Party and the National Party expressed their dissatisfaction about the selection of South Australia for this vital work and chose to condemn the decision during the recent Federal election campaign. That may have been useful for their own political purposes, but it caused some considerable concern in Sweden. So much so that, when Premier Bannon visited Sweden recently, he had to assure the company of the State Government's commitment to the project. I know that the dissatisfaction expressed really had little to do with the tendering process, but rather was spurred on for political reasons. There is jealousy, I know, from the unsuccessful tenderers and some other States but, of course, in the case of those States they need look only at their industrial relations records to see why they were not successful. This unnecessary furore is perhaps a measure of just how important the contracts will be for South Australia.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): I was quite intrigued with the two speeches that led this debate on the Address in Reply. I refer to the speech made by the member for Adelaide and, more recently, an effusion by the member for Fisher. The member for Adelaide sought vehemently to talk up the economy of South Australia. Of course, in recent times the Government has done a lot of this. It seeks to spread abroad the picture that in South Australia we are doing very well and that conditions are improving. No doubt the member for Adelaide did it to the best of his ability and maybe even with a degree of conviction. However, I think it is time that Governments both in South Australia and in Canberra faced reality.

The problems that we are experiencing and the unpalatable and difficult measures that both the Federal Labor Government and the South Australian State Government now have to institute are the direct result of their profligacy when they came to Government. They have increased enormously the difficulties facing this State and this nation. They came to government doing precisely what the member for Adelaide enjoined us not to do: they talked down the performance of the then incumbent Governments and said that all was woe. Further, they had a large grab bag of promises to increase expenditure. In 1982 the Liberal Federal and State Governments sought to exercise financial restraint. We sought to restrain Government spending, because we knew that in the long term that was the only way in which we could achieve economic success.

But what did the Labor Party do in the Federal and State spheres? In post war years the Hawke Administration came second only to the Whitlam years in the disastrous explosion in Government spending. For the first two years of the Hawke Government there was an average real growth in budget outlays of 7.1 per cent, which of course has made the exercise upon which it has now embarked all the more

difficult. As I say, it ran second to the fortunately short term of the Whitlam Government, where expenditure in real terms over three years was in excess of 11 per cent. In my view, in the Federal sphere we never quite got over that, although it is pleasing to note that during the time of the Fraser Government growth in real terms over the seven year life of that Government was only 2.2 per cent. This is typical of the Labor Party. It is elected on a large grab bag full of promises and it then increases Government spending.

The figures from the South Australian budget reports indicate that, during the first two years of the Bannon Government, in 1983-84 South Australian Government expenditure increased by 6.9 per cent in real terms and that in 1984-85 it increased by 11.2 per cent in real terms. That has exacerbated enormously the problem for South Australians and for Australians in coming to grips with the intentions of both those Administrations, that is, to reduce Government expenditure. We are in this sorry situation of the Federal Government suddenly deciding that too much gross national product is being devoted to Government purposes and then trying to reverse that trend. That same process is being attempted in South Australia.

They can seek to blame whom they like, but the plain fact is that both State and Federal Labor Administrations have themselves to blame for being unable to sustain growth in Government expenditure. Suddenly they suggest that they are interested in rural producers and the mining industry which provide the bulk of our export earnings. We suddenly hear that there has been a fall in commodity prices, but that is a small part of the story. What has the South Australian Administration sought to do to solve the problems in the rural community? For a start, it has sought to kill off all rural industry by removing the payroll tax concession, which has supported industry and allowed it to be sustained in country areas.

The Labor Government has done that. Of course, we know where its political priorities lie: there are no votes in the country, so what? However, the Government cannot get over the fact that, in the main, this country relies on the rural producer for its export income. Although the rural producer may have no political clout and therefore be given no political consideration by the Government, that is a fact. What has happened to fuel prices and to the costs that farmers in this country must pay? What has happened to the taxation regime? What has happened to the ability of farmers to store up in a good year against hard times? They have all been wiped out by the Federal and State Administrations.

I would suggest, Mr Acting Speaker, that in your capacity as the member for Adelaide you have a look at the most recent publication of the Engineering Employers Association. The member for Adelaide relied on an issue of this publication to sustain the point that conditions in South Australia were improving. I will paraphrase what the honourable member said, without being dishonest: lest I be accused of quoting selective sources of Government origin, I shall cast my net wider. I shall refer to one of two points made by the member for Adelaide to sustain his speech. Unfortunately, I was not present when the member for Adelaide made his speech, but I subsequently read it. The Engineering Employers Association provided to the Government a report which was optimistic in tone and which was quoted at length. Well, I have today the August report from the Engineering Employers Association and in the 'Summary' it indicates the following:

For the year ended 31 July 1987 employment fell by 1.9 per cent.

Although it points out that 'only 31 per cent of respondents reported reducing their employment over the year', the bald fact is that employment in the engineering industries fell by 1.9 per cent over the year ended 31 July 1987. I point out that this is a later report than the one from which the member for Adelaide quoted, which was a May report to the Government—but no hard data was quoted. The most recent survey indicates that:

For the month ended 31 July 1987 employment fell by 1 per cent, with 38 per cent of respondents reducing their employment levels over the period.

It is also reported that:

Production activity declined. The activity level index fell from 88 to 85 points.

It is further stated under 'Future Expectations':

Production activity is expected to show further slight declines.

I am quoting material from the very organisation from which the lead speaker in this debate quoted. However, this is the most up-to-date information, and it indicates that over the last 12 months there has been a decline in employment and activity in the engineering industry area.

Any rational examination of all the indicators that are available from the Bureau of Statistics shows quite clearly that South Australia is doing poorly in respect of all those indicators, bar one, in relation to the rest of Australia. I want to highlight them. The first of these indicators concerns population. During a policy speech that the Premier made in 1982 I remember the Premier saying, while shedding those great big crocodile tears, that South Australia was losing its most precious asset, namely, its people. He said that they were leaving the State. If we believed then that they were leaving the State, we have had a flood since this Government was elected. The figures show that the trickle has turned into a flood. We are doing the worst bar none of any State in terms of population growth and migration out of the State. The figures from the Bureau of Statistics indicate that quite clearly. Where are the crocodile tears now?

I have referred to the speeches (and we got a bit more of this from the member for Fisher a moment ago) talking up the economy. Let us look at the hard facts. I remember the doom and gloom statements when the Premier and his then Deputy were in Opposition. Every day we heard about the tragedy of unemployment. The population migration is worse now than when they were in Opposition. We seek to point out the facts, yet we are told we are being pessimistic. The sooner this Government faces the facts and does something about the situation, the better. What really gripes me is the fact that the problem is of the Government's making. It opened the floodgates.

In the House today we have had a fair discourse on lying. We are not allowed to call people liars, but when it comes to election time I have firmly concluded that the Party most obviously in government around Australia now will say anything to win. To win at all costs is the motto in politics in this day and age, but the Labor Party kept some of its promises and certainly spent a fair bit of Government money when it got in to buy off interest groups to which it had made promises on which it could not renege, but of course it is now renegeing. Broken promises by the Labor Party have become an art form. It has the media mesmerised. The present Government has broken its promises in relation to the education lobby. That is one promise it tried to keep in 1982, and it led to a great blow out in the budget. It does not even try to keep its promises now.

This information from the Bureau of Statistics shows that South Australia has the worst percentage of population growth of any State. In employment growth we have the

second worst percentage—fifth out of six. Our unemployment figure is worse by 1 per cent than the national average. We had all the crocodile tears from the then Deputy Premier about the tragedy of unemployment, yet the national average is now 8.3 per cent and we have 9.3 per cent. In terms of overtime hours worked—an indication of business activity—we have the worst record around Australia, bar none: seventh out of seven. Talk about bottom of the class! Yet we are supposed to talk about how wonderfully South Australia is doing. These figures of the Bureau of Statistics over the past 12 months cannot be refuted, and they show that South Australia is the dunce of the class. Ours is the worst performance bar none.

With regard to increase in weekly earnings, we have come fifth out of six. How does the Labor Party—the friend of the worker—swallow that, when we have the Prime Minister off on a fishing holiday with some of the new billionaires around Australia, his new found friends, the media moguls and others? These people say, 'Vote for the Labor Party; I've been able to make a billion dollars'. We saw the big presentations in Sydney. There was the Prime Minister in his dicky suit, as large as life—or as large as he could make himself look with his permed hair—with the media moguls who have made a billion dollars. What about the fellow down the street who has had an average increase in weekly earnings of \$3.40? How does such a person sight this friend of the workers, the Prime Minister of Australia, off last week on his fishing holiday with some of his new millionaire mates? Who is the Labor Party kidding? The increase in average weekly earnings in South Australia has been \$3.40, while around Australia the average increase has been \$6: here we are, second to bottom!

I turn to the CPI. In terms of inflation, our cost of living in South Australia is second to highest. So here we have the long-suffering man and woman in the street, householders, with a minimal increase in average weekly earnings, the second lowest increase of \$3.40, against the national average of \$6 a week but with the second highest inflation increase. We have had the second lowest increase in take-home pay, and increases in State taxes and inflation.

It is all very well for the member for Adelaide and the member for Fisher to talk up the economy and to mention the submarine project—I will say a word about that in a moment. We have heard employers and the State Bank putting forward an optimistic scene, but what about people in business? We had 988 bankruptcies in South Australia, placing us fifth. Victoria had 943 bankruptcies with three or four times our population—we really are going well! I turn to building values. We hear all about these wonderful projects. We have the ASER project, but the Premier will not tell us what it has cost—that involves commercial confidentiality, so he will not tell us about it.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: I will get around to the sub if I have time. If members think that the sub will save the economy of this State they are fooling themselves. I agree with the union man who, when talking about the Grand Prix, said that we were getting plenty of bread and circuses but no real growth.

I turn now to building values, where we came fifth. We came fifth in private investment, also. We hear a lot about tourism and that it is going to save this State, yet we are sixth in terms of available beds in hotels and motels; I do not know how we are going to cater for this flood of tourists. In manufacturing value added per head we are in about the middle: we are certainly not leading the nation. Retail sales are way down—we are not even in the middle of that lot. Members may recall a press report quoting Mr Coles, Pres-

ident of the Retail Traders Association, which indicated how badly we were doing in relation to retail sales when compared to the rest of Australia. It is fine and dandy to be optimistic, particularly in Government, but it would be a lot more helpful if the Government were prepared to face facts.

While I am talking about trends, I will mention one other area of interest to me as a former Minister of Mines and Energy and now shadow Minister of Mines and Energy. South Australia's record in relation to mineral exploration is absolutely appalling. Let us look at what has happened since this Government came to office. The figure for overall expenditure on mineral exploration in 1980, the Liberal Party having come to power in 1979, was \$31.1 million; in 1981, \$51.1 million; and, in 1982, \$45.5 million. Then, with the advent of the Labor Government, which came to office on a great grab bag of promises, the amount plunged to \$34 million and then recovered to \$46.6 million in 1984. In 1985 the amount declined to \$42 million and—wait for it—in 1986 (and this involves mineral exploration—nothing to do with oil prices) it was \$20.2 million—less than half the 1985 figure.

Mr Robertson: How about world prices?

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: World prices did not plunge in that 12 months. They have been depressed for a number of years. Suddenly, there was an enormous drop in money spent on exploration. Indeed, ever since the Labor Party was elected there has been a drop off, an accelerating drop off. The amount invested halved in 12 months.

Mr Groom interjecting:

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: If the honourable lawyer from Hartley is interested, let him look at that.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: These are the latest figures available. If Roxby Downs is excluded—that mirage in the desert which the Premier opposed so vehemently when the indenture was in the House—it is even more pathetic. I can understand why no efforts have been made in uranium exploration. The Australian Labor Party allows some uranium to be mined. If it is mined with other minerals, it does not hurt you; if it is mined on its own, it hurts. Have you ever heard anything so absurd? I suppose that we in the Liberal Party can take some credit. The fact that we got it through Parliament had the effect of changing the national ALP uranium policy. What it came up with was absurd, but at least it let Roxby Downs and a couple of other uranium mines go. It is not surprising that only \$156 000 was spent on uranium exploration last year. In 1981, that figure was \$6.9 million, but that was before uranium could be mined from some mines but not from others.

Last year \$1.2 million was spent on copper exploration, yet the figure was \$3.2 million in 1981. Although the figure for base metals is incomplete, \$1.86 million was spent in exploration. For coal, \$1.5 million was spent, but in 1981 it amounted to \$13.3 million. I turn now to diamonds. Much has been heard about diamonds from the very low key Minister of Mines. He is so low key that one never sees or hears him. He has made exciting ministerial statements about diamond searches in South Australia. Every now and then he sticks his head above water to make some pronouncements here by way of such statements. The last one that I recall (there have been precious few) was about diamonds. In 1986, \$1.2 million was spent exploring for diamonds. In 1981 it was \$3.4 million; that is more than twice as much. Other exploration totalled about \$2.2 million, which makes a grand total, if Roxby Downs, that mirage in the desert as described by the Premier, is taken out, of

only \$8.23 million on mineral exploration in South Australia.

I do not want to accuse earlier speakers of misrepresentation. They have a song to sing and they sing it to the best of their ability and talk up the economy. Any dispassionate view of what is happening in South Australia indicates that this State is running a very poor last on all the indicators which matter around Australia. The most significant indicator, if one is talking about the common weal and the contentment of the population in general, is what has happened to the people's take-home pay, their taxes and employment. This State has done appallingly. What does the Government hang its hat on: the Grand Prix and a submarine project?

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: I am jolly pleased that the Government acknowledges after doing its best—

Mr Groom: And Roxby.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: Yes, and Roxby. I am delighted to hear that reference to Roxby; I am always delighted to see a conversion. It is almost a religious conversion. What happened to Paul on the road to Damascus pales when compared with what happened to the Labor Party with the Roxby Downs project. It really does. The Labor Party did not see a blazing light; it was a more intense conversion than anything Paul experienced or than one could imagine in terms of religious conversions.

Here was a Party adamantly opposed to the mining of uranium and to Roxby Downs. Its members fought tooth and nail in this place to defeat the indenture which I, as Minister, and the Liberal Government had worked so hard to put together. The select committee received minority reports from the now Deputy Premier and the now Minister of Mines and Energy saying that the uranium was to be used in atom bombs and that it was not safe and the Government should not go ahead with it. The now Premier got up and said that it was a mirage in the desert. The only reason that it got through the Parliament and came to fruition was because of one courageous member of the Labor Party in the Upper House who was prepared to support the Liberal Party and the project.

An honourable member: What happened to him?

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: He is an outcast. They did not give him a medal. They did not give him the highest honour they could bestow on him for having the foresight to pre-empt their decisions, to see ahead of them—'Here's a man with some vision'—but two months later they saw the light. Two months later there was a change; there was a sudden dawning. The national policy was changed and uranium could be mined if there was something else buried with it—and, of course, there always is. In this case, there was a bit of copper. If there was something else with it, one could mine it, but if there was no other mineral of economic significance, in their judgment, one could not.

That absurd policy still obtains, but at least Roxby is up and running, and the Government is now seeking to paint Roxby as one of the jewels in its crown. I am delighted to see it get a mention. I am delighted that we have had this wonderful conversion of this magnificent project in the minds of the Labor Party. I am pleased about that. Of course, if it were not for the Liberal Party and Normie Foster, it would never have come into existence. At least the Labor Party now waxes eloquent about the project, although it rather tends to be embarrassed about the circumstances of its conversion to advocacy of it. Well might members of the Labor Party hide their heads in shame in relation to their behaviour in this place when they tried every trick in the book to scuttle it.

What is the other great project that is going to save the average man in the street, who has the lowest take-home increase in pay and the second highest taxes around Australia? It is the submarine project. I ask you!

Mr Tyler: What's wrong with that?

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: Nothing. There is nothing wrong with it at all. I just want to get this in context. I am very pleased that South Australia managed to get 20 per cent of the submarine project. It is irrefutable: I am very pleased. If we are thinking about the way in which we are going to spend taxpayers' funds, it is contributing more than we would get if we cut up this cake on a population basis. We have a little less than 10 per cent of the population so, I suppose, in that sense we have done well.

If one has a look at the population and the share, we have done well. We did not do anything like as well as we did during the time when we saw that enormous expansion in manufacturing in South Australia during the years of the Playford Administration, when we had 9 per cent of the population and 20 per cent of the industrial growth. We have not done terribly well since the Bannon Government came to office in 1982: we have had a decline of one-third, no less, in the manufacturing base in South Australia during that period, and here we have this glorious submarine project which is suddenly going to save South Australia! Let us get—

Ms Gayler interjecting:

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: Yes, I do, but let us get it in context. When the Premier was waxing eloquent for the umpteenth time about this wonderful submarine project, I was so bold as to say publicly, 'I don't know how he can really claim we have the project when, in fact, we have got 20 per cent of the project.' I was pleased we got 20 per cent, but I could not really understand his saying, 'We have been awarded the project'—he said it again last week—when we got 20 per cent. That, obviously, stirred up Mr Duncan, who has been promoted. He got an accolade from the member for Fisher a minute ago. That, obviously, stirred up Mr Duncan, who was charged with doing the Government bit and getting the package together, so Mr Duncan rang me up—which surprised me. Here was a public servant ringing me up, taking me to task for something I had said publicly. I thought, 'This is interesting: this is a new twist.' I had had a letter from Mr Guerin—

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

Mr GROOM (Hartley): That was a very disappointing contribution from the Deputy Leader of the Opposition and another example of South Australian Liberals downgrading South Australia, and I think that is a great tragedy.

The Hon. E.R. Goldsworthy: Speaking the truth for a change.

Mr GROOM: Contrary to what the Deputy Leader of the Opposition asserted, Labor Governments have always been prepared to make hard decisions when hard decisions are necessary. The Deputy Leader of the Opposition spoke about the period up to the 1982 election when the Liberal Party was in office. Many of our problems at State level stem from the sorts of budget deficits that members opposite ran up during their three years in office from 1979 to 1982.

In August 1982 members opposite told the people that they had a balanced budget. That just was not the truth. The result was a \$63 million deficit because they were not prepared to make the hard decisions necessary to govern South Australia. They were not prepared to increase taxes, which was the hard decision required to balance our bud-

getary position. They allowed us to go into hock for something like \$63 million. That is a tragedy and that is why they are in Opposition today: because they are not capable as financial managers and they are not prepared to make the hard decisions when necessary. Instead, we see the type of carry-on witnessed during the recent Federal election when the people of Australia finally reached the point where they were prepared to reject the types of bribes that Opposition members were offering in an attempt to get into Government.

Formally, I extend my sympathies to the families of the Hon. Mr Loveday and the Hon. Don Simmons, who was a member of this House when I was a member during the period 1977 to 1979. As a result of my contact with the Hon. Don Simmons over many years and during my time here in the House, I have great respect and admiration for his contribution as a member of our side of the House.

I turn to item 3 of the Governor's speech, which states:

The economic situation facing our nation and this State is again the most important issue before my Government. The Commonwealth Government continues to pursue policies designed to stabilise our economy through restraint in public spending and tight budgetary controls, and my Government is prepared to play its part in achieving the longer-term prosperity this country so greatly needs.

As a result of significant reductions in Federal funding, there inevitably will be difficult and sometimes unpopular decisions in the allocation of State funding, but this is a challenge my Government has accepted, and will address in its deliberations leading to the framing of the forthcoming State Budget.

It is certainly true that South Australia is facing very difficult times ahead. We have faced them in the past and I have no doubt that, with competent management by the Premier and Cabinet, we will get through those problems.

Many of our current problems stem from the fact that we are locked into a national economy which in turn is locked into an international economy, so many of the problems that beset us in terms of origin are beyond our control and, in terms of solutions, are very substantially beyond our control. Many of our problems stem from our current balance of payments position, our unfavourable balance of trade. For some time we have had persistent trade deficits and the Federal Government has sought to take corrective action to stabilise Australia's economy, both externally and internally. For a number of years now we have been faced with the consequences of persistent long-term trade deficits—a currency losing its purchasing power and a growing indebtedness because the Government has to borrow or use some other means to prop up the balance of trade deficit.

As a consequence, there is loss of confidence by trading partners, economic disruption domestically and a reluctance to trade on the part of other countries. These are the most severe long-term consequences of persistent balance of payments deficits. The policy options open to a national Government in circumstances such as these include adjustments to the exchange rate. Now that we have a floating dollar, the market place tends to increase or decrease the value of our currency according to market conditions of supply and demand, except to the extent that the Reserve Bank does intervene.

Another policy option open to Government is to increase protection for domestic industry through tariffs, quotas, embargoes or subsidies. That is not a desirable option, otherwise we will get back to the situation we had in the 1930s where we had trade embargoes and the whole world suffered as trade declined. Therefore, increased protection to Australian industry is not a viable option as it leads to a drying up of trade. We must earn foreign currency to be able to trade and purchase another country's goods. Another policy option is foreign investment and borrowing. Foreign

investment is not all that bad so long as it is used to genuinely expand industries in Australia or create new industries. If it is only portfolio investment, that is similar to a loan. One cannot borrow for too long because that creates a tremendous interest burden.

Another policy option is to stimulate export industries, which the Hawke Government has sought to do and has done with some success since coming to office. Yet another policy option is increased domestic productivity, in particular through increasing the level of our export industries, whether through mechanisation or new methods of management. Another policy option is to reduce imports, which can mean a reduction in our standard of living.

We all know that for the past decade much of Australia's unfavourable balance of trade has stemmed from a drop in prices for our primary exports and minerals. As a result of the drop in prices for our wheat, wool, meat and minerals we now have a balance of trade deficit on our current account. Coupled with this, the Federal Government has had to face enormous problems as a consequence of the massive borrowings by private enterprise simply to finance takeovers of existing industries in Australia, without doing anything for those industries. The massive amount of money that has been borrowed from overseas has had a substantial destabilising effect on our domestic economy.

Prior to January 1986 the format of our balance of payments was divided essentially into three parts: first, the balance of trade which, as honourable members know, is the total value of our exports less the total value of our imports; secondly, the balance on the current account, which is the balance of trade plus the balance of international transactions in invisible items; and, thirdly, the balance on the capital account, which is the balance on the current account plus net capital inflows, that is, capital inflows less capital outflows. In January 1986 the format in Australia was changed and a new system was introduced which makes it much easier to work out what is happening with our balance of payments. The new structure has part of the balance on current account as the balance on goods and services, which is broken into the balance on merchandise trade (which is exports less imports) and the balance on services, which includes such things as shipping costs, travel and transportation costs.

Another segment, the balance on capital account, is now divided into official transactions, that is, Government transactions and non-official transactions, namely, private sector transactions. As a consequence we can now see in a much clearer way how foreign investment and borrowings come into Australia and from whom. It makes it easier to see what is happening. One of the great tragedies in looking at our balance of payments over a number of years is that, whereas we tended to have a surplus on our merchandising account, we always have a substantial deficit on our services. This includes shipping charges because we do not have a developed merchant navy.

Mr Gunn: The Seamen's Union ruined that.

Mr GROOM: The Menzies Government was in office for a very long time in the 1950s and 1960s and had the opportunity to build up a merchant navy. However, it did not do so and we are paying dearly as a consequence. Persistently in relation to our balance of payments one finds that the lack of a merchant navy is to Australia's detriment. The lack of a shipbuilding industry—

Mr Gunn interjecting:

Mr GROOM: The Fraser Government cancelled the shipbuilding industry in Australia, to the long-term detriment of our national interest. Make no mistake about that. As a consequence of the change in the format of the structure of

our balance of payments, one can now see what is happening to the balance on the capital account with regard to non-official transactions, that is, private sector transactions. In fact, 60 per cent of Australia's foreign debt has now been piled up by the private sector. Foreign borrowings by Australian business has increased 10-fold since 1980—far outstripping the public sector debt. At the end of 1986, while the total foreign debt was \$105 billion, some \$63 billion was incurred by the private sector, and this represents a massive increase over the \$6.5 billion owed by business just seven years ago.

A recent article which gave a breakdown of some of those figures indicated that, of the \$105 billion of foreign borrowings, \$20 billion had been borrowed by the Federal Government, \$20 billion by State and semi-government authorities and \$63 billion by the private sector. Where has that gone in Australia? It has gone to finance takeovers, and we will have to pay for those takeovers.

Because of the massive amounts of money coming into Australia we have an enormous interest bill of something like \$9 billion a year. Australian taxpayers, in some way or other (through the costs of goods sold or taxes), have to pay for these enormous borrowings. What have they really done for Australia? Very little. They have added enormous inflationary pressures in our country. They have added to the costs of goods sold. They have disrupted our domestic economy—and for what purpose?

Mr Meier: Why doesn't the Government take action?

Mr GROOM: It is trying to restructure and control the situation. It is very difficult in a country such as Australia, which has a separation between the Federal and State Governments—a diffusion of power—for a national Government to get on top of these types of problems. However, the Hawke Government is doing so, and the latest balance of payments figures show that. It is a very difficult, traumatic path. BHP alone owes 6 per cent of Australia's net foreign debt—some \$4 billion. The Bond group owes \$1 billion of our foreign debt. Elders-IXL (that is, the President of the Liberal Party, I think, federally; he will be the President—

The Hon. J.W. Slater: President elect.

Mr GROOM: The President in waiting. Elders-IXL owes \$600 million of our foreign debt. As I said, the reason is because of company takeovers, and nothing else. They are not expanding Australian industry. They are not establishing new industries. They are just borrowing to take over existing Australian industries.

The money flows in and out of the country and the interest bill goes up. It costs \$9 billion a year in interest alone to finance these takeovers that the Australian community has to meet. This desire to finance takeovers with borrowings is sad. In the past businesses used to raise capital funds for this by issuing shares, but it does not do that anymore. It is no wonder that we have persistent balance of payments crises. It is no wonder that we have inflation at the level that I again saw in the paper today. It is no wonder that we have difficulty in controlling these influences. The fact of the matter is that all Australians must pay for these company takeovers, and the cost of all our goods and services in Australia will rise as a consequence of these company takeovers.

It will take a number of years to get on top of the inflationary pressures, and the disruption to the Australian economy is enormous. As I said, the lack of a national shipping line shows up in our merchandise trade account. For example, the balance on merchandise trade (reading from the ABS statistics of June 1987) showed a surplus of \$166 million.

When one looks at the net services, that is, the shipping charges, freight charges and transportation (true, travel is included in that figure), one sees that there is a deficit of \$287 million. That really knocks us backwards. The June figure deficit for services was \$213 million, for April it was \$169 million and for March it was \$137 million. They are enormous deficits for which we must pay. We are paying dearly for the failure of the Menzies Government to establish a national shipping line in Australia.

It has been a massive task to bring about structural changes in Australia. The Hawke Government had to make the hard decisions necessary to reduce our domestic deficits to stabilise our economy. In fairness I will say that, because we have had massive deficits in Australia at a national level, it is true that the Federal Government has had to borrow internally to finance those deficits as well as borrowing from abroad, and this has meant less money has been available for business. Really, when one weighs things up it pales in significance alongside the massive borrowings that business has indulged in simply to take over Australian industry.

The domestic policy responses on the part of a national Government to maintain internal and external balance when confronted with problems of this proportion has been fiscal—tax increases. The Hawke Government has ruled out further tax increases because Australians have had enough of them. So, we now have expenditure cuts as a fiscal measure. That was done in the May mini budget.

On a monetary level there is only one consequence of this type of occurrence with regard to our balance of trade, that is, interest rates rise because one has to attract foreign funds to pay for the deficit. Interest rates have been kept high. Another domestic policy response has involved wages and prices. The fact is that the trade union movement has played a significant role in assisting the national Government to correct the structural problems that underlie our economy. The wages accord with the trade union movement and the wage indexation system in place since 1983 have assisted the Hawke Government enormously in grappling with the monumental problems that beset it when it came into office. Members opposite do not want to forget that when the Hawke Government came into office it faced a Howard deficit of about \$9 billion, yet the then Liberal Government was supposed to have some sort of roughly balanced budget.

Members interjecting:

Mr GROOM: I saw the report. An economic report was given. Howard suppressed from the people the true magnitude of the deficit. That is where the problems stem from—again, a Liberal Government losing control of the national economy. That is what happened with the Howard-Fraser Government in 1982-83.

They lost control just in the same way that the State Liberal Government lost control in 1982, because it was not prepared to make the hard decisions that were necessary at that time for our economic prosperity, our future prosperity. The then Liberal Government was weak, as the member for Spence has said. Howard left a legacy of a \$9 billion deficit. The Tonkin Government left a legacy of about a \$63 million deficit, and it has been the Labor Governments that have been brought into office which have been prepared to make the hard decisions to manage Australia's economy. We are getting on top of the problems; there is no question about that. The balance of trade figures show this. Even at State level, as I said, when one considers that we are locked into a national economy and do not have the decision-making authority to control the national economy—indeed we are locked into an international economy—one realises that the Labor Government here in South

Australia has done remarkably well to keep South Australia buoyant and as prosperous as possible in the current climate.

It has done remarkably well to grapple with South Australia's economic problems in this setting. True, there is a bit of belt tightening ahead and some unpleasant decisions will need to be made. Those decisions need to be made, they will be made, and, as a consequence, South Australia will continue to be the prosperous State that it is.

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

The Hon. H. ALLISON (Mount Gambier): I join other members in expressing regret at the death of two former parliamentary colleagues, one of whom I served with and the other (Ron Loveday) whom I knew rather fleetingly but I knew him as a conscientious Minister of Education under whom I served when he was Minister. Don Simmons was a colleague who served in this House with most of us who are present today and I know that members will agree with me when I say that he will be missed. He was a man of fine character and a gentleman in the true sense of the word. We express our sympathies to the families of both those fine men.

His Excellency's speech reflected tough times ahead for South Australia and it contained relatively few new promises other than those that have been foreshadowed in legislation that passed through the House during the previous parliamentary sessions, for example, the workers compensation legislation about which we may be able to speak more a little later. First, an issue that has been very dear to my heart for well over a decade relates to the Finger Point area. I must confess it was a pleasant surprise when I heard Finger Point mentioned by the Governor when he said that he expected the project would start soon, of course subject to a favourable report from the Public Works Standing Committee.

Members may recall that during 1982 a public works report, which was almost ready for tabling in this House, would have recommended the commencement of a \$7 million treatment plant at Finger Point. In 1982, upon its accession to office, the Labor Party shelved that plan. Between 1982 and 1985, apart from complaints from the South-East, very little was heard about the matter. However, during 1985 Premier John Bannon visited the South-East several times and he announced that the removal of whey products from the sewerage system would enable a smaller plant to be built. Moreover, he promised, along with the then Minister of Water Resources (Hon. Jack Slater), that the Finger Point Sewage Treatment Plant would be built and commissioned by the end of the financial year 1987-88.

An honourable member: Wasn't 1985 an election year?

The Hon. H. ALLISON: My colleague appears to be expressing a little cynicism, but more of that later. To date, there has been little or no progress other than a hearing in Mount Gambier by the Public Works Standing Committee before which I placed a rather substantial submission consisting of about 100 pages, a large amount of which was historical, setting out the progress—or lack of it—that had occurred over the preceding decade. In the final paragraph of the personal submission that I presented to the committee was a form of a request that a sewage treatment plant should be built of adequate size to cater for private and commercial development in Mount Gambier for the next decade and beyond.

At that hearing, which I think was in March this year, senior staff members of the E&WS Department gave reassurances that they had considered all contingencies and that

the \$4.7 million plant that was currently before the committee would be adequate for Mount Gambier's immediate and foreseeable needs. Also at that meeting mention was made that a Scrimber plant was to be constructed by the Woods and Forests Department and, very soon after the conclusion of that hearing, it became apparent that the E&WS Department had not made adequate allowance in the \$4.7 million treatment plant for the considerable amount of additional effluent that would be discharged by the Scrimber manufacturing plant of the Woods and Forests Department.

In fact, the Scrimber plant will take round log, from 100mm to 150mm diameter, and crush it. It will then be formed into very large structural sections using some form of glue, possibly a formaldehyde glue such as that used by Softwoods, and formerly Panelboards in Mount Gambier. The formaldehyde glue will be pressed out of the structural sections. It would have to be considerably diluted and it would then represent a considerable additional volume to be transmitted down the sewage treatment plant for processing at Finger Point. The Engineering and Water Supply Department has admitted that changes will have to be made to the design, and I believe that that is one of the reasons why the Public Works Standing Committee has not yet reported. I expect that before long the committee might bring down a report recommending the construction of a somewhat larger treatment plant than originally envisaged by the Premier.

In fact, the \$7 million plant, which was originally proposed by the Liberal Party and which would have been commenced in 1982-83, with the provision of three-quarters of a million dollars in funds during the preceding 18 months, would have been perfectly adequate for the next 15 to 20 years for Mount Gambier's commercial, residential and industrial needs. It is an irony that the delays may in fact have thrown the construction costs of the smaller plant into the much higher bracket.

However, I am very hopeful that the Premier will take immediate action to ensure that the plant is commenced, because the Premier does (and I am sure he would admit it) have a credibility problem. First, the Premier and his then Minister of Water Resources, Jack Slater, promised in 1985 that by the end of the current financial year the project would be completed and would be commissioned. Secondly, during the 1985 State election campaign the Premier was part of action shots taken at Finger Point showing bulldozers in the process of excavating the hole where the Finger Point treatment plant was to be built. This gave the residents of the South-East every impression that the scheme was 'all stations go' and that the bulldozers were there to commence the construction work. As I have said, last year the bulldozers were quickly removed; I think three days later they were on their way back to Adelaide after the election shots had been taken.

Since then, the project has been deferred. However, fresh promises have been made, and much to my delight the mention in the Governor's address that construction was expected to commence soon gives everyone in the South-East considerable hope that the project will go ahead. More than that, I point out to members of the House that only two days ago I expressed faith in the Premier by saying to the public of Mount Gambier that I believed that he was a man of his word, that he would have qualms of conscience if the project were not commenced and that I fully anticipated that the Premier would be as eager as I was to see this project get underway, in view of the promises that he had made to the public of the South-East. I stand by that confidence that I have publicly expressed in the Premier.

However, unfortunately, some considerable cynicism remains in the minds of residents in the South-East. Only yesterday, an editorial in the *Border Watch*, Mount Gambier, headed 'Wrong fingers in the pie', with an oblique reference, of course, to Finger Point, stated:

Yet again South-East residents face the verbal outpourings of State politicians on the on-again off-again yet never built Finger Point sewage treatment works. As to promises made about the project and promises broken, from the hallowed corridors of Parliament House in North Terrace, there is always the power of the public to make its feelings known at the ballot box.

The tragedy of Finger Point is that the litany of election time funding carrots, dangled before an ever more cynical South-East public, may now have created a false public belief that no State Government, regardless of its political colours, will ever build the sewage treatment works. Both major Parties have had their chances. The reasons why it hasn't gone ahead become irrelevant—the fact is that Finger Point is yet to be built. Our voice in protest has become muted—any salvos fired are mere squibs, snuffed by the self-generating public belief that political promises on Finger Point are not to be taken seriously.

If this region has any community strength, any sense of priority, any desire for each town, each electoral region to combine for the region's overall good, then it is on Finger Point—the State Budget is nigh—our sustained voice of protest should be at a crescendo.

That simply reflects the degree of frustration experienced by people across the whole of the South-East. It was an editorial that was certainly unsolicited on my part because, as I said, I mentioned only yesterday that I felt that the Premier had acted in total good faith and intended to go ahead with the project. I hope now that the Premier will personally oversee the progress of the long overdue project. More importantly, a report is first required from the Public Works Standing Committee recommending an appropriately sized plant.

Finally, the true test will be made when the Premier's budget papers reveal the presence or the absence of funding the commencement of the project. Of course, the budget papers are only some two or three weeks away, and I hope that the cynicism expressed by the editor of the *Border Watch* is countered by funds being made available. If not, then as a very parochial local member—and I know members of the House will recognise that fact—that I shall once again join the *Border Watch* and my electors in their call for a universal expression of support from the South-East for yet another major petition to be presented to the Government.

I now leave the Finger Point issue and refer to another issue which is of State importance but which is essentially part of the South-East, namely, the problems confronting the Woods and Forests Department. These problems concern me greatly. I raised them during Estimates Committee B last year and the problems are several, although during the 1986 Estimates Committee Minister Abbott implied that my concerns were probably more imagined than real.

However, members will recall that in February 1983 the Woods and Forests Department was savagely hit by the bushfires when over 20 000 hectares—that is 50 000 acres for those of you who think like I do and convert—or 20 per cent of South Australia's State forests were decimated and destroyed by fire. The salvage and storage operations carried out by the Woods and Forests Department ensured that much of the timber was saved for milling and for sale. Had that not been done, the productivity of the industry in the South-East would have been sorely reduced and probably might have been closed down for some time through lack of timber.

It really was a successful salvage operation, even though lessons learnt during that time indicate that it was rather costly and that different salvage methods would be undertaken were another bushfire to hit us. But, as I said, much

of the timber was saved and the industry continued to operate on a profitable basis.

One outcome was that an \$11 million loan was made to the Woods and Forests Department by the Federal Government. I think it was interest free for the first three years, because no principal was repaid, but since then that loan has been taken over by SAFA, the South Australian Financing Authority, and now that principal and interest are due to the Federal Government through SAFA. Woods and Forests has an additional debt. Even though much of the timber was salvaged, none of the loan was repaid.

Further, the department faces considerable additional expense, which I believe will be carried through until 1992 at the rate of between \$5 million and \$7 million a year, money that it will have to borrow to clear burnt forests and for reforestation. Otherwise, the South-East in years to come will have limited timber supplies—it must be reforested quickly. The principal and interest repayable to SAFA along with additional borrowings over the next five or six years will throw the Woods and Forests Department further into debt. Those borrowings are to cover reforestation and other costs.

Further unspecified borrowings will be needed for the Scrimber plant being constructed in Mount Gambier adjacent to the Woods and Forests Department mill. It involves an experimental procedure which is untried in the marketplace and for which markets must be found. If it is to succeed, money in addition to the \$11 million provided by the Commonwealth Government for bushfire relief will have to be borrowed. The IPL Holdings New Zealand investment, whose factory for manufacturing laminated veneer lumber is situated at Nangwarry in the South-East, has also proved to be very costly. In Estimates Committee B on 9 October 1986, at pages 498 and 499, Minister Abbott said that the Woods and Forests Department had invested in a respected New Zealand public company. I ask members whether it is not true that that company was almost insolvent having experienced considerable financial problems during the years before the Woods and Forests Department became involved with it. I believe that the Minister was derelict in his duty in not having a proper financial search made prior to allowing the Woods and Forests Department to invest in that company through the South Australian Timber Corporation.

In October 1986 the Minister, or the accountant in the Woods and Forests Department, admitted that IPL New Zealand's figures for June 1986 were not yet known. I tried to get some idea during the Budget Estimates Committee of the profitability and stability of that company. I ask members to join me in expressing concern that this project has cost the Woods and Forests Department and the South Australian Government \$7 million more than it should have because of that near insolvency of IPL Holdings New Zealand. In his report of 1986 the Auditor-General drew attention to SATCO's lack of equity in its investments and pointed to its then deficit of \$23.2 million, with minimum equity. SATCO's increased trading, involving \$14.7 million worth of sales through its Melbourne outlet, resulted in a \$69 000 return, down from \$223 000 in 1984-85.

SATCO's returns are minimal when one considers the huge volume of timber going out through Melbourne. By far the largest proportion of Woods and Forests Department sales go out through Victoria. SATCO's return on investment in 1986 was \$1.5 million, which was insufficient to meet the \$2 million needed by SATCO simply to repay interest on its investment. No wonder the Auditor-General was concerned at the lack of equity of SATCO in its investments. Here we are going deeper into debt with a company

trading and unable to meet interest repayments, let alone principal.

The long-term liquidity problems in SATCO are not diminishing: they are rapidly increasing. Why? The Auditor-General reported that a loss was recorded on the Beddison investment at Nangwarry, that there was a lack of return from IPL and that, later, additional losses were sustained. The Scrimber cost and that of the experimental venture still have to be met, and that could run into millions of dollars, before some return can be expected down the years. There may also have been losses resulting from purchases by SATCO of log haulage firms in the Mount Gambier district, firms which, I understand, were subsequently sold up. No one wanted to buy them as going concerns so all the equipment—trucks, forwarders and logging equipment—was sold. There may have been substantial losses from SATCO's buying out timber firms.

The Minister did not report, but I discovered and questioned him in October 1983 on the fact that he had appointed a committee to review forestry legislation. A document issued on 4 September 1986 said that the main purpose of the committee was to determine whether the South Australian Timber Corporation and the Department of Woods and Forests should be amalgamated. The committee of review was informed that it would report on a regular basis, I assume monthly, but to date I have seen no report from that committee, and it worries me immensely that SATCO's affairs are in such a state as to possibly jeopardise the operations of Woods and Forests if an amalgamation takes place. I say that in light of the considerable deficit suffered by SATCO, its lack of equity and its inability even to meet interest repayments. That burden would be passed on to Woods and Forests, which is already having financial problems of its own: profitability counterbalanced by the substantial additional borrowings as a result of the 1983 bushfires, with SAFA and the State picking up the tab. An explanation from the Minister to the House is long overdue, in light of the relatively short, reassuring but not necessarily totally adequate responses given to me during the budget estimates of 1986.

Added to these problems is another serious threat: the Sirex wasp. In the *Weekend Australian* of 25 and 26 July 1987, readers were advised that the Sirex wasp was silently devastating thousands of hectares of valuable South-East pine forest. Indeed, it is estimated that the Sirex wasp, which mainly strikes trees aged 10 to 16 years, and the bark beetle (*ips grandicollis*) which strikes trees under 15 years old, have jointly infested an estimated one million trees in the world's worst Sirex infestation so far reported. Has the Minister been derelict in his duty again? I believe that Woods and Forests has more trained foresters (probably over 40 of them) who are expert in the management of forests than any other part of the industry in Australia. Has the Minister encouraged them to concentrate on the administration of the commercial operations of SATCO and Woods and Forests when those foresters could well have directed their considerable skills to attacking the Sirex wasp?

Has he lost sight of the fact that the Sirex wasp has already devastated Tasmanian forests? It is 20 years since the wasp was accidentally introduced into Tasmania from New Zealand, and New Zealand has lost a large proportion of its pine forests. The problem is not new: it has long been recognised. In the report of the Department of Woods and Forests for 1986, only recently released, at page 11 recognition was given to the widespread sighting of Sirex and *ips grandicollis* reported for the year 1985-86. The approaches made by Woods and Forests and private forests have probably been too little, too late.

Suddenly, there has been a surge of interest and activity, with the release into the forests of nematodes, which are worm-like creatures which will infect the reproductive organs of the Sirex wasp and cause sterile larvae to emerge. There is also the possibility of releasing a predatory wasp in spring and summer of this year to attack the fully grown Sirex wasp, but I question whether the Minister has been derelict in his duty in not getting this problem seen to much earlier, because this could be a far greater threat in the long term than the single bushfire of 1983. All of us know that SATCO projects, the new Timber Corporation projects and the Woods and Forests and private enterprises in the South-East will fail if raw material is not available. All of us, particularly in my electorate, acknowledge the importance to the economy in the South-East and to South Australia of the forestry industry. It is our life's blood.

The public must be kept truthfully and fully informed of progress made in all of the matters I have raised, and I can assure the Minister that these are by no means exhaustive. There are many other things that I could have mentioned, but time will not permit. Perhaps I might say here that I regret the passing of the hour which members formerly had in which to address problems of State, national and local interest relevant to the budget, and we now have half an hour in which to put matters of vital interest to our electors.

It simply cannot be done. I alone have some half a dozen more key issues which I would have addressed this evening—and I do not see anyone saying, 'Hear, hear'. Perhaps members are quite pleased to see me go. But they are issues I would dearly have liked to address on behalf of my electors. Half an hour is simply inadequate. They say that if you do not do your homework you speak for an hour; if you do your homework you speak for half an hour. My homework would have kept me going for a couple of hours, I can assure you.

While the 1986 Woods and Forests report, recently released, showed a great asset increase—very reassuring—\$83 million of this was simply a revaluation. The Valuer-General revalued the forests and put another \$83 million into the Woods and Forests—\$83 million which simply cannot be realised because it is the land on which the timber is growing. So, it can be misleading: a major part of the increase from \$142 million to \$230 million is simply an escalation in land values. The Woods and Forests and the South Australian Government loans are up from \$31.5 million to \$34.5 million; trading funds have increased by only \$500 000 and, as I said to members, I simply cannot over-emphasise how worried I am about the future of South-East forestry, the industry which offers employment and security to a great many people in the State of South Australia, and I am vitally concerned for the Woods and Forests employees.

I know there are only some two minutes left. My next topic would have been the abolition of the payroll tax rebate scheme, an issue which is to be dealt with, I believe, in some considerable depth by my colleague the member for Victoria, who has joined me in research into the implications of the Government's new regional development scheme which it regards as a dynamic policy, yet that dynamic policy intends to take away \$6 million or \$7 million in payroll tax remissions from South-East companies over the next three years and to replace them with a \$3 million scheme.

This sounds to me like the pea and thimble trick. You can have either the \$6 million or the \$3 million. I know that industry in the South-East would prefer the existing scheme with \$6 million rather than its phasing out and the introduction of a brilliant new scheme offering only \$3

million. I asked the Minister for a copy of the scheme, but I did not receive it. I begged a copy from one of the local industrialists and found that the dynamic new scheme was very much akin to the one advertised three or four years ago with the carrot on the front. Really, it offers little more than the scheme then in progress which was simply dropped and which really did not bring any more industry into the South-East or the country regions of South Australia.

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

Mr FERGUSON (Henley Beach): I support the motion before the House which was so ably moved by the member for Adelaide and seconded by the member for Fisher. I congratulate them on the research that they did and the excellence of their speeches. I also extend my congratulations to His Excellency, who provided us with a blueprint for the next 12 months in South Australia. He grappled with the realities of the economic downturn that is facing us as a result of the Federal Government's need to balance its budget.

I also take the opportunity to extend my condolences to the families of the two former members of Parliament—the Hon. Ron Loveday and the Hon. Don Simmons—who have died since the Governor's last speech. I knew Ron Loveday exceptionally well. The next ALP conference, which begins on Friday night, will be the 31st consecutive conference that I have attended. Therefore, I have been in the Labor movement for long enough to know of the work of Ron Loveday, who was a Minister during the Walsh Government, the first Labor Government in this State for many years. Ron had the problem of grappling with those over-enthusiastic Labor supporters who had been in the wilderness for many years and did not know what it was like to have control of the Treasury benches, and he had some very difficult portfolios to handle. I had the opportunity to see how he handled them, and he did it very well.

Don Simmons was better known to me. He was also a Minister of the Crown, and before that he was a lecturer at Adelaide University in the field of computing science. He went on to serve the State very well in the portfolios that he administered. On his retirement from Parliament, Don did not disappear from the political scene and at the time of his death was still the President of the Hindmarsh Federal Electorate Committee. He was of great assistance to me during my campaigns in Henley Beach and was never too shy about taking up the hack work necessary during these campaigns. When I wanted somebody to go out and letter-box an area or do a bit of door knocking—neither job an easy one—even though he was very ill at the time, Don was prepared to take on those tasks. I extend my sincere condolences to his family.

One of the advantages of the Address in Reply debate is that it gives one the opportunity to speak about the problems that arise within one's electorate. I turn to a problem with which I have been grappling for the past five years: the need for specialised child-care provisions within my electorate. I was delighted to hear the announcement made about this time last year that the Federal Government was making available sufficient funds for about 20 new child-care centres in South Australia. My investigation led me to understand that a child-care centre would be established within my electorate at Kidman Park. The location is very logical as it is geographically centred in an area which has no facilities at all for day care for children. From time to time I have had discussions with the sectional head of the Children's Services Office at Woodville. I am not completely happy with the communications I have had with

this office, and this is the time and place to express my dissatisfaction in that regard.

I can understand the Children's Services Office not being too keen to see me from time to time, as I have often knocked on its door. I have found it very difficult to gain access to the sectional head of the office, and the protective web that surrounds the office at Woodville is something that I have not encountered in any of my previous dealings with Government departments or indeed private enterprise.

Having been a union official for many years and a politician for more than five years, I have never known a company manager or departmental head who has not had the time to see me occasionally. In this instance there needs to be better communication between me as the local member and the head of the Children's Services Office at Woodville. It is often extremely difficult to maintain constant telephone contact with anybody who happens to be in charge, but from time to time I did manage to discuss the problem of lack of child-care in my area and the possible site of the new child-care centre.

In the first instance the site suggested was adjacent to the Barbara Kiker kindergarten and I undertook to see what steps I could take to be of assistance to the CSO in its desire to utilise the site. I approached the Mayor of Woodville and Woodville council planning officers to ascertain whether the site adjacent to the Barbara Kiker kindergarten at Kidman Park would be available. In the final analysis the Woodville council could not see its way clear to provide this land in this area and negotiations have continued between the Children's Services Office and the Kidman Park Primary School for the establishment of a day care centre in that area. It would appear that negotiations in relation to this site have been inordinately long. That may be because I am anxious to see the establishment of appropriate day care within my electorate. However, I have difficulty understanding why it has taken so long for one department to reach agreement with another department when they are both under the administration of the same Minister.

I have ascertained from recent inquiries that agreement was reached on 6 August when the school council finally granted approval for the design of the new child-care centre, and I understand that written negotiations have centred around the approval of sufficient car parking space for the child-care centre. It is my understanding that now that agreement has been reached the detailed design will be undertaken by the Department of Housing and Construction and this matter will then be referred to the Minister for approval. The Department of Housing and Construction has led me to believe that, depending on the final cost arrived at, it will take the department no longer than three months to complete the design. The basic design is standard and applies to all child-care facilities. Alterations to that design are dependent upon the site selected. For example, a sloping site would require modification to the standard plan and would therefore increase the costs. I certainly hope that there is no hold-up so far as the Department of Housing and Construction is concerned and that the Minister can see his way clear to give early approval for this project so that the problems and need for child-care in my electorate may be overcome.

I have been given to understand that the building should be ready for occupancy by August next year. As someone who is so impatient to see this facility, I find it very difficult to understand why it should take so long in view of the fact that the Department of Housing and Construction gave an undertaking that the building would take no more than three months to erect. However, I know that the wheels of

Government grind exceedingly slowly, and I will have to be content with this date.

I am anxious that the completion date of this building, for which the people of my electorate have been waiting so long, does not suffer from the executioner's axe when the budget constraints are taken into consideration. I believe that the people of my electorate have waited for so long in order to be provided with child-care services that they deserve to have this facility.

Mr Meier interjecting:

Mr FERGUSON: I do not know where the other 17 child-care centres are going, but I can inform the honourable member that my electorate could easily take two child-care centres, the need being so great. During my visit to the United Kingdom I looked at the situation of the British Government providing private moneys for the establishment of rental homes. My objective was to see whether any of the ideas could be adapted to the South Australia situation. However, I was completely unimpressed with the way in which the United Kingdom has handled rental housing over the years. It seems to me that leaving the responsibility of rental housing to local government can only lead to a multiplicity of problems. One of the problems has been that the provision of housing in the United Kingdom has been pregnant with politics.

It seems to me that the system that we use in Australia, where rental housing is controlled by an independent authority, and by the Housing Trust in South Australia, is an ideal way of covering the situation. Therefore, to some extent I can understand why the Thatcher Government has determined that local councils will no longer have authority to build rental houses. When one political Party controlled a particular council, that council was determined to build all rental housing because it assisted that particular political Party. On the other hand, when the other political Party was in power no rental housing was built and concentration was placed on other types of shelter. Therefore, from time to time there was an uneven balance in relation to the erection of houses.

It seems to me that the rental situation in the United Kingdom is in an absolute mess. The night that I left London was very cold, and it was estimated that 38 000 people would be sleeping under the bridges there because of the lack of shelter. Indeed, I discovered, while walking down Regent Street in London, that people were bedding down in the recesses of shop fronts, covering themselves with corrugated boxes for warmth. I was informed by local council authorities that it was estimated that approximately 100 000 people were seeking shelter in London on any one night. In addition, councils have a statutory obligation to house the homeless under certain circumstances. Therefore, in Great Britain we find hundreds, if not thousands, of people being sheltered overnight in what one can only describe as scungy bed and breakfast hotels, and many families live in one room in these establishments.

The irony of the situation is that it is costing local government millions of dollars to house people and, if that money could be directed towards building new homes, many more new homes could be built and the problem, if not totally solved, would be partially solved. The Tory Government's handling of the housing situation in that country, so far as rental accommodation is concerned, is a very sorry record.

In addition, because of the problems that are occurring there, there is what I describe as a slow revolution now occurring in that country. There has been a tradition that shelter should be provided by the councils, and prior to the election of the Thatcher Government more than 80 per cent

of the total population was housed in what are described as council houses. Since the policies of the Thatcher Government have been brought into operation, this percentage has changed and now more than 50 per cent of people in Great Britain are housed on a home ownership basis. This has been brought about by the selling of current council housing stock to the residents at bargain basement prices, and this in itself has brought problems because the housing stock that is left is deemed to be undesirable by the local population and they are not buying. Insufficient money is available for the maintenance of this housing stock, which is very old indeed.

So we can see, and I was able to see on my visit to that country, many boarded up two, three and four storey buildings which were in such disrepair that they had become uninhabitable. However, about £700 million is spent each year in providing direct grants to building societies in that country, and until now building societies have been using this grant money, with gifts of land usually from local councils, to provide for 80 per cent or 90 per cent of the capital needed to build new homes, the remainder being borrowed and capitalised by the rental charged.

I had an opportunity to discuss the matter with the CIPFA statutory authority, which is a subsidiary of the Chartered Institute of Public Finance and Accountancy, especially established to advise and provide financial services to local government and other Government authorities. It has a particular expertise in providing financial advice to both local government health services and central Government. This organisation has been responsible for putting together a package that has floated an organisation known as the National Home Loans Corporation, and it was recently over subscribed, raising an amount of £66 260 000 for the establishment of rental housing for North Housing Association Limited, which is a housing co-operative that is being used as a vehicle in building rental homes using private investment.

I should say that North Housing Association Limited is an entrepreneurial organisation which takes all the risks involved in the development of new housing estates. In their words, if there is an overrun because of delay in building etc., then North Housing Association has undertaken to sell sufficient land and stock to make up the shortfall. The money can then be floated on the Stock Exchange of the National Home Loans Corporation, and vast amounts of money have been invested in this organisation by British institutions. It is my understanding that British institutions are prepared to invest, provided that they can get a return of between 6 and 12 per cent over and above the rate of inflation. North Housing Association Limited has been more or less guaranteed this return because it had an initial injection of 30 per cent of the capital from the Government.

In other words, the Government has been prepared to subsidise private industry to the extent of 30 per cent of the initial capital in this venture. This money comes out of the budget allocation of £700 million that has been allocated to the housing associations, and the United Kingdom Government hopes that will turn its £700 million into £2 100 million by using input from private money into the housing area.

I have great difficulty in accepting that any organisation should be guaranteed a profit by the provision of a subsidy from the Government. My own principles struggle to accept Government subsidies to private enterprise, and I think that anyone who believes in private enterprise would have the same problem. However, what is happening in the United Kingdom is an interesting experiment and, at the end of

the day, what really matters is the amount of affordable housing that is generated for rental purposes. Perhaps the best way of tackling a problem for the input of more money into the rental housing area would be to allow the floatation of a company along similar lines for experimental purposes to see whether this sort of input is satisfactory and whether the people using the product can afford to do so. I would be prepared to accept an experiment along these lines in order to have a look at extending the sort of finance that is available to our housing stock in South Australia. Much of this depends upon the affordability of the rents involved, so that the sort of system that we are using in South Australia would have to be looked at carefully if this sort of investment were to go ahead. Obviously, in order to guarantee a 6 per cent real return on investment money, rents would have to rise considerably.

I turn now to another subject in which I have shown some interest during the past year. I refer to the compulsory immunisation of children against rubella in order to completely eliminate this blight from our society. I understand that, if we were to embark on this particular project, measles may never occur. Medical advice tendered to me has stated that measles would be virtually eradicated if every child were immunised, ideally between 12 and 15 months old, but certainly before attending a child-minding centre or school.

Recently a considerable amount of publicity has been given to the Commonwealth Government's provision of \$600 000 to the States to assist them conduct an education program. A radio campaign based on the slogan 'Just One Shot' has been implemented and the message is that protection can be afforded safely and simply by a single vaccination injection which is free and readily available. Measles is more than a childhood rash: it is a virus which can cause long-term damage. One child in 10 with measles will contract an ear inflammation which can cause deafness. One in 1 000 will succumb to acute encephalitis, a disease which can cause brain damage and sometimes death. Many will suffer from pneumonia, and one in 15 000 will appear to recover but at any time from two to 20 years later will show symptoms of a disease which is fatal.

Recently, the *Advertiser* produced an article from a political commentator columnist for the *Canberra Times* who wrote a story about her daughter Kiri who died of a disease known as SSPE, and who would not have died if measles had been eliminated in Australia.

The usual arguments about compulsory medicine are the ones of civil liberties, expense and/or religious objections. I believe that the State can justify the introduction of compulsory medication in a situation in which an infected person may well infect other people. The argument of the general good of the community comes into play. I believe that every person in a situation such as this has the right to not be infected by somebody else, and therefore the civil liberties question can be argued both ways.

If a mother or a father were prepared to argue that their child ought not to be immunised because of their belief and if the danger were only to the child concerned, then perhaps—and I only say 'perhaps'—there would be a valid argument, although the question then arises of the rights of the child. However, in my view, the question changes completely when people refuse on ideological grounds to give permission for their child to be immunised but the child is then in a position to pass on the disease to someone else. In many States of America the authorities have no qualms about imposing the law of compulsion on the general population to ensure that all children are immunised. The story is similar in France where the French, too, adopt a different

attitude. It is perhaps one that we could adopt, as it overcomes the civil liberties argument. In France, it is not compulsory to immunise a child against rubella; however, a child cannot enter school until he or she has been immunised.

In relation to religious questions, in the past the State has been prepared at least once during my lifetime to overcome these objections. I refer particularly to the compulsory chest X-rays which were undertaken. I remember being required to attend a caravan, placed in the local area, to have my chest X-rayed as part of a community health program to eliminate tuberculosis. After an initial outcry from some sections of the community, this exercise proved to be successful and it was eventually carried out without any great difficulty.

Mr Blacker: The same should happen for AIDS.

Mr FERGUSON: Yes, I agree. My inquiries with the Queen Elizabeth Hospital have revealed that this project is very successful, and it could be described as being the most successful program that has ever been achieved in community medicine. I see no reason why Parliament ought not consider very seriously the matter of compulsory immunisation for children no matter what objections might be raised from a religious point of view.

The third possible objection to a program like this would be the cost involved. I understand that the actual cost per child for immunisation is \$4. If this amount of money is weighed against the amount of money which could be saved by the elimination of the problem to which I have referred earlier, the balance sheet would well and truly be in the community's favour. I know from my experience in Parliament that any idea that is raised by the community takes a long time to reach fruition. I raise this matter at this time in the hope that it can be taken up by the authorities in the Health Department with a view to providing a compulsory program, in perhaps, say, three or four years time. By that time, the campaign currently under way, with all the resulting publicity and newspaper space devoted to it, would have had the effect of convincing mothers and fathers that their child ought to be immunised against this obnoxious disease and so the effort required by the State to round up the few remaining children would be cost effective. I am sure that the Parliament would give bipartisan support for this matter and that the matter would be taken seriously by both the Commonwealth Government and the various State health authorities.

Mr OSWALD (Morphett): I support the motion. I extend to His Excellency the respect of the residents of the electorate of Morphett. I also want to convey to the families of the late Hon. Ron Loveday and the late Hon. Don Simmons my sympathy in this difficult time of bereavement for them.

It is interesting, I find, to reflect on the way that the Bannon Government has operated since it came to power in relation to its release of good news and its hiding the bad news. Behind a screen of submarines, racing cars, the ASER development and the casino, this State is not doing well under the Labor Government. I must admit that the Government's PR machine is very good. The Premier is good at always being present when there is good news and of stepping back and letting someone else take the odium when there is bad news.

But the problem is that the Ministers are not accepting any blame for bad news. There does not seem to be any bad news when one hears Government members speaking in this debate, when indeed the bad news pervading this State at the moment is continual. If we examine the record, we will find that we lead the mainland States in the decline

in the number of building approvals. We have the highest incidence on the mainland of mortgage repayments. We have the lowest growth in retail sales of States on the mainland. We have the greatest decline in the sales of new cars on the mainland. We have the highest rate of bankruptcies in the Commonwealth. We have the highest increase in State taxes and charges, and over the past 12 months we have seen an 88.2 per cent increase in working days lost through industrial disputes in this State. Yet the Government and the Premier would have us believe that everything in South Australia is rosy. Of course that is not the case.

The Bannon Administration may be proud of its records of subs and racing cars, but I would hasten to point out to the House that this would have taken place under a Liberal Administration anyway. We are tired of the way in which this Government is constantly talking up the economy while families in South Australia are trying to work out how they will handle the crisis of survival at a time when their cost of living is increasing at an alarming rate. All this is going on while we have a very slack Administration running the State.

We have problems in the Police Force and their ability to investigate crimes. I have been informed of quite serious crimes that have been reported to major police stations and it has taken over six months before detectives have had an opportunity to attend to those files. Our courts are choked. The parole system is not working. The transport system is breaking down. The Government is way behind in the strategic planning of the main roads systems of the State. Our hospitals are beset with long waiting lists, and so the story goes on.

Let me tonight pick up my concerns in the area of road reconstruction in the metropolitan area. I instance the Government's record of strategic planning in the western and south-western corner of metropolitan Adelaide. On 20 June 1983 the Bannon Government announced its decision to scrap the north-south corridor between Sturt Road and Anzac Highway. At the time the Liberal Party objected strenuously to the scrapping of the project; indeed, if the Liberal Government had been re-elected in 1982 we would have seen that transportation corridor between Sturt Road and Anzac Highway under construction now.

When the Government made the announcement, the Opposition and all member councils of the Southern Region of Councils strenuously opposed the Government's decision not to proceed with the corridor. The Bannon Government tried to justify its action at the time by saying that there would be a population projection based on their figures, which they claimed they had available to them, south of Darlington of only some 1 or 2 per cent. That is what they were trying to say. They told us this in the Parliament and they told the public.

At the time, the Southern Region of Councils, using the expertise of their own officers, were estimating that there would be an increase in the region of some 16 per cent. There was quite a subtle difference between what the Government was trying to tell us and what the Southern Region of Councils was saying. The 1986 census, which has just become available, indicates that the councils were correct. I advise members to check those figures as they will find in hindsight that the councils were right. On 18 October 1984 the Southern Region of Councils wrote to the Advisory Committee on Planning registering strong disapproval at the removal of the corridor between Sturt Road and the Anzac Highway. The letter stated that the southern region was experiencing a rapid population growth and pointed out that the region was closely monitoring a number of indicators which pointed to a high growth over the following

12 months. As an example they used approvals for domestic dwellings which in some council areas had shown a 16 per cent growth rate.

At the same time various council members challenged population estimates which appeared in the 1981 Australian Bureau of Statistics census and which were used by the Department for Environment and Planning in its estimations for the period 1986 to 1991 and beyond. The 1986 ABS figures have proved those councils to be right, as I have said, and proved the Government to be wrong. However, it is now history that, despite the advice of local councils, and against the advice of expert opinion within the Highways Department, the Government took the decision to sell off the land in the north-south corridor south of Anzac Highway. The member for Fisher smiles, although the electors in Fisher are deeply affected by this decision.

The next significant announcement on the Government's road strategy came on 15 August 1984, when the Premier announced plans for a third arterial road to supplement South Road and Lonsdale Road, which is also called Ocean Boulevard. The new road was to provide a bypass around Darlington to avoid that bottleneck and was also intended to avoid building an expensive overpass at the Darlington-Flagstaff Hill junction.

Whilst welcoming the third arterial road to the south as one to facilitate traffic flow to the developing areas south of Darlington, councils again pleaded with the Government not to sell off the land north of Darlington because, despite the new corridor, all southern traffic would still arrive in the vicinity of Darlington at Sturt Road and would then have to be channelled onto existing arterial roads.

With regard to transport planning on the plains north of Sturt Road, whilst the third arterial road is welcomed in the south it will do nothing to help solve the long-term planning for the movement of traffic in the south-west corner of the metropolitan area on the plains north of Darlington. It will do absolutely nothing for the monitoring and handling of traffic on the plains.

At that time the Mayor of Marion, who was also Chairman of the Southern Region of Councils, made an observation which was reported in the *Southern Times* that the State Government planned to build a \$45 million arterial road which would still leave the motorists in the south stranded. He complained that it would lead to traffic chaos on roads throughout the whole Marion city area. Mr Newberry said that the State Government's plan for a 9 km road to link Sturt Road at Tonsley Park and the Reynella bypass was a step in the right direction but did not go far enough. He said that the road would help to relieve a traffic bottleneck at Darlington but would cause even more congestion on major roads in the Marion council area. He said that the traffic corridor should go at least as far as Anzac Highway and described the State Government's decision to sell off the land for this purpose as short-sighted. That was sound, practical advice based on years of experience of a mayor who had been involved in that district for the whole of his time in local government.

It was also based on the statistical evidence that was available to him from the officers who worked in the Southern Region of Councils. These very sensible and objective remarks were taken up the following week by the Labor member for Mawson (Ms Lenehan) in the *Southern Times*. In an amazing outburst, the honourable member labelled Ted Newberry's concerns as 'a mealy-mouthed response from a community representative'. She also said that his comments were inconsistent and unreasonable. In fact, it was a spirited defence of the indefensible by a member of the Bannon team; namely, the long-term implications in

transport planning to sell off the arterial corridor that had been planned between Sturt Road and Anzac Highway.

Let me pause for a moment to reflect on what the Government has really done between Darlington and the city to assist commuters south of the bottleneck at Darlington. This is the whole point of the argument for those of us who live on the plains. What has the Government done to assist with traffic movements between Darlington and the city on those five arterials, which start with Brighton Road, go to Morphett Road, Marion Road, South Road and on to Goodwood Road? Since 1983, a bridge has been widened on Flagstaff Hill Road where that road joins the South Road bottleneck and a slip lane put in, which was certainly appreciated. Apart from some road dividers on one of the arterials—Brighton Road—nothing has happened. That is what we are waiting for: some activity.

There has been a lot of talk and a lot of rewriting of the plans that were originally based on incorrect statistics and bad political decision making. What respite has been provided for those of us who live on the plains from the increasing traffic that is coming down from the southern region? It was well known in 1984 that, when the third arterial was announced, unless the new road was augmented by a range of complementary road improvements, the Darlington bottleneck would simply move to a new intersection. That prediction is as valid today in 1987 as it was then. Since the announcement in August 1984, which is three years ago, very little, if anything, has been done to complement or to improve the road network. Some minor works have been done and I know that the member for Hayward is aware of that. No major works have been set in train to help get rid of the traffic as it comes down over the cliff face. Whilst I acknowledge that the Emerson overpass at South Road was an expensive and significant project in long-term planning, the reality is that, in 1987, the urban arterials are, in some cases, just holding their own and, in many other cases, overloaded. Yet, the Government, through the Department of Environment and Planning and through the Department of Housing and Construction, is planning to build and is in the process of building tens of thousands of homes south of Darlington. The extension work can be seen on the major roads south of the cliff face; yet, no work is being done on roads north of the cliff face. That is the concern of those who live in that area.

What happened to the plans to widen South Road between Anzac Highway and Daws Road? Members opposite are nodding, trying to insinuate that the work has been done. Will they please tell me what has happened to the roadworks that were due to have been completed by now on South Road from Anzac Highway to get traffic on the move down to Daws Road? Let me refer to the supplementary planning report for South Road between Anzac Highway and Daws Road, dated January 1985. That report states:

The department is proposing a project which will provide two lanes of traffic in each direction with a 3 metre wide median and costing \$3.5 million. This will include some parking bays and extended clearway periods. The proposed works will overcome most of the present traffic problems and allow for some increase in the traffic volume. However, long-term traffic demand from southern areas cannot be accommodated on South Road. The proposals will provide worthwhile road improvements at a cost which can be funded within current financial constraints, and are compatible with the overpass to be constructed at Emerson over the next two years. Construction of the widening is scheduled for 1985-87.

I repeat—from 1985 to 1987. It is now August 1987, and nothing has happened. Planning has taken place in the department; thousands of man hours of expense have gone into that, but yet nothing has happened. I say that this Government is hiding behind its submarines and its racing

cars. We all like good news, but when we get down to the sound, basic planning for the community of roads, hospitals and schools, I thought all lumped in together as being the basics, what do we have? Nothing is happening. I put to the House that one should consider this in detail.

There are some other points raised in the South Road planning report which are equally applicable to the other four urban arterials as we approach 1988. Heavy traffic usage throughout the day on South Road results in problems for drivers, pedestrians, local residents and business houses. Let us just look at some of these problems. First, there is the continuing problem of accidents. There are more accidents on South Road than on most other roads with similar traffic. Vehicles waiting to turn right and vehicles being manoeuvred to park are the major causes of accidents.

Secondly, because of the nature of the road, pedestrians face hazards when trying to cross four lanes of traffic. Thirdly, we have the narrow lanes and parked vehicles which always cause danger to cyclists. We have vehicles waiting to turn right, with others being manoeuvred to park and having difficulty turning in front of oncoming traffic. Traffic congestion is there all the time and causes frustration and tension for drivers, and they are accidents looking for somewhere to happen.

Drivers are detouring into adjoining streets and, once again, causing difficulties. Of course, the road surface continues to break down. That was planned to be completed by now, and nothing has happened. Under the Bannon Labor Government improvements have not been made. When will we see the reallocation of resources from within the State budget to allow increases in construction on our urban arterial roads, particularly in the south-west corner of Adelaide?

Gone are the days when the Bannon Government could keep churning out propaganda, as it does at pre-election time, on its transport strategy and then not deliver. I am certainly no longer going to be silent and sit back in the south-west suburbs and listen to the grandiose schemes which come out at election time, the commitments that they make and then fail to deliver. I am tired of that. The Government has had ample opportunity to deliver, and enough is enough. I would really like to know when the Government intends to reconstruct South Road. Perhaps the Premier could tell me that during the budget speech, which is coming up shortly.

When will we see the grade separation of South Road over Anzac Highway, or has that been completely forgotten now? What is the plan on subjects such as that and does the Government ever intend doing anything about Goodwood Road? What does the Government intend doing with the Oaklands Park or Hove railway crossings? Is that too hard, and has it been put on a back burner not to be discussed in public because the Government does not know the answers to it?

When will we see the commencement of construction activity on this third arterial? I have been told from within the department that it has been put on the back burner indefinitely. I was incorrectly quoted in the paper as saying that it has been axed, but I have been told that it has been put on the back burner. Those of us down on the plains want to know when this will happen, because at the moment it appears that it will not happen for some time. Heaven knows, the Southern Region of Councils has been trying to ascertain project details since December 1984.

The Government's refusal to respond to requests only adds to the speculation that, like a many other projects that this Government associates itself with at election time, we will not see a third arterial corridor constructed for many

years to come. On 5 June 1984 the then Minister (Hon. R.K. Abbott) said that the decision was to sell off the north-south corridor because it was surplus to requirements and the funds could be used for road building. The reality is that that did not happen. The approach was based on the historic value of the properties. That money went into the Highways Fund, while the rest went into general revenue. That was blatantly dishonest. I believe that the Government should be absolutely condemned for the way that the money, which was committed by previous Administrations for the general building of roads in the metropolitan area, was siphoned off sideways into general revenue to be used elsewhere. That is not the way to run a competent Government.

On 15 August 1984, both the Premier and the then Minister of Transport made their announcement on the third arterial. It is interesting to see since then how they have managed to keep submerged questions from the Southern Region of Councils, never giving an answer, never giving information so that no-one can question when this roadway will be constructed. On 10 December 1984, the Southern Region of Councils wrote to the then Minister (Hon. R.K. Abbott) requesting information. It was a very polite letter. I do not have time to read all of it but I will read a couple of relevant sentences, as follows:

Maintaining a keen interest in the Government's response to the working group's recommendations, the region has directed that I write to you respectfully requesting details of the stage reached in assessment of the recommendations, and of the possible date of any announcement of your assessment and the Government's response.

That is fine. That was followed up on 4 February 1985 with a reply from Jack Wright, Acting Premier. The relevant section in his letter states:

In the light of the complex issues involved, it is not possible to provide a completion date for this project, until a detailed preliminary investigation can be completed.

There is no problem with that. It was in its early stages and one would not expect absolute details at that stage. However, moving from February to 4 September 1985, the Southern Region of Councils replied to the Government in a letter addressed to the Hon. G.F. Keneally stating:

I am instructed to write to you, in your new capacity, to again request details of the new southern arterial road announced over 12 months ago by Premier Bannon.

The next letter was from Mr Keneally back to the Southern Region of Councils, and it stated, in part:

I expect that construction will commence in the early 1990s once design and documentation, land acquisition and other related matters have been finalised.

In September 1985, an interesting coloured brochure appeared, and it referred to the third arterial, as follows:

Construction of a new third arterial road from Sturt Road to Reynella to augment South and Lonsdale Roads (design and pre-construction work in progress—

it states that it is already in progress—
construction to start in the early 1990s).

Following that, on 25 September, in a letter to the Hon. G.F. Keneally, the Southern Region of Councils stated:

I was grateful to receive your estimates of the road's commencement and possible completion dates . . .

At that stage the council was still cooperating with genuine information. Then one year later on 11 September 1986 (and I cannot blame the council for trying) there was another letter from the Southern Region of Councils to the Hon. G.F. Keneally as follows:

Since it is now more than a year when we last corresponded on the matter of the planned new road, the region would be glad to please receive news of progress made, and of any projection for completion of the stages of the new arterial.

Recent population growth has confirmed the region's contention that high priority should be given to alleviating traffic conges-

tion problems which are evident every day on South Road, while the definite planning of 20 000 new homes in Woodcroft and Seaford must be expected to seriously exacerbate the difficulties our residents are already experiencing.

That letter was responded to on 20 October by the Minister of Transport, who stated quite categorically (and this is the key sentence):

It is the policy of the Government that the provision of the new road to serve the southern region is of high priority. Construction is intended to commence by 1990—

not 'in the vicinity of' or 'about' but rather that construction is intended to commence by 1990—

with completion within five years of that.

That was clear and unequivocal, and at last in October 1986 the region was happy to receive that indication. Since then the region has continued to exchange letters. It is now August 1987 and we are no closer to knowing when the road will be started, what are the Government's priorities or where we are going.

The Hon. D.J. Hopgood interjecting:

Mr OSWALD: Both the public and councils want to know what is going on with plans for the third arterial road. Despite the interjection from the Deputy Premier, I do not see what is wrong with a representative of the region asking questions of the Government in this place when its own system cannot obtain answers. That highlights the secrecy of this Government and the way it operates. It browbeats people to the point where they feel that they cannot ask for information on what is happening because it might come into the category of bad news information. The Government wants only the good news—not the bad news—discussed.

The bad news at the moment is the Government's lack of involvement in strategic transport planning which would mean something to local residents. Surely the Government does not want me to remind the public of the fact that nothing is happening on the southern regional plains. The ALP's entire road planning and building strategy for the 1980s was based on inaccurate traffic predictions. There were political implications in the axing of the transport corridor through some of the inner suburbs.

Reference has been made to inaccurate traffic predictions ever since the beginning of the 1980s—the Government has used the wrong figures. Unfortunately, the next batch of figures being put together now by the department (and running months behind) make it difficult for us to come to a final conclusion on traffic projection figures. Although preliminary figures have already established that the selling of that corridor was a mistake and that the five urban arterials are now almost reaching saturation point, the building of houses to the south goes on. We have a problem on the plains in the south-west corner with which the Government cannot come to grips. It is time that the Labor Government stood aside in relation to transport planning in this State and handed it over to a Government that knows about future transport planning, namely, a Liberal Government.

Mr KLUNDER (Todd): As Chairman of the Public Accounts Committee set up by this House, from time to time I bring up reports of that committee in this place. Tonight I will speak about those reports which deal with future assets replacement in this State. This Public Accounts Committee inquiry came about more or less by accident.

In March 1984, during a public hearing with officers of the Highways Department, I asked the Commissioner of Highways for the value of the road assets under his control. He replied that at that stage he was unable to provide that information. When I asked him whether he could provide a rough estimate he indicated that his department had, some six months earlier, set up a group to produce a corporate

strategy which would encompass the management of the total State road network and that the determination of replacement costs would be part of that strategy. However, this was expected to take several years. Some quick checking indicated that most other Government agencies were in very much the same situation.

Soon afterwards I heard that the Engineering and Water Supply Department had conducted a study of its assets and that the officer who had been instrumental in the production of that study was available for secondment. That officer (Dr Penny Burns) worked with the Public Accounts Committee for a period of two years producing these eight reports. In those reports the committee projected the cost of replacing the assets of Government agencies over the next 50 years and found that enormous increases would occur in the amount of asset replacement falling due towards the end of this century and that the increased level would be sustained well into the twenty-first century. The reason for that is, of course, quite simple. The post-war baby boom and European migration dramatically increased the amount of infrastructure in the 1950s and 1960s, and further into the 1970s and 1980s. All this public infrastructure inevitably wears out or becomes obsolete and an asset replacement echo of the boom period expansion has to occur some time.

A worst case hypothesis is that the replacement echoes in agencies and departments coincide, reflecting their common growth period after the Second World War. A sobering thought is that it does not have to be a worst case situation for it still to be quite serious. The committee set out to ascertain the following information about roughly 80 per cent of the State's replaceable assets: replacement value, age and condition, economic life, the amount of money spent on refurbishment and replacement of assets, and the extent to which the public accounts provide useful information on asset management.

Discussions with managers and accountants and an inspection of asset registers revealed that, typically, asset registers contained information on many minor assets but did not include major assets such as buildings; secondly, that such accounting records as existed were mainly in historic cost terms; thirdly, that the year of acquisition might well be recorded, but not the years of major upgrades; fourthly, that such records of replacement or refurbishment as did exist could be recorded in the accounts as either maintenance or capital works; and, finally, that realistic estimates of economic lives of assets or their major components were not recorded at all.

That big picture was not true in all respects, but it certainly was a typical kind of picture. Very little data was available in a form which was useful for projecting when future asset replacement would fall due. Of the agencies checked by the Public Accounts Committee, only two had current replacement cost values for their assets. The Electricity Trust had half its assets valued at current cost, and these values were used to calculate depreciation and report asset values in its public financial statements. The Engineering and Water Supply Department, which had only just completed its study, had determined current replacement values for its assets, but this information was not used in its accounting and financial reporting system at that time.

Therefore, for Government agencies as a whole, there was little information readily available which one could use to project either the cost or the timing of assets replacement falling due in the longer term. Major refurbishment or replacement was typically treated as if it was new capital work, and it waited in the queue for money with other capital items. Capital projects were a mixture of new and replacement assets, but the mix was not recorded. Some

asset replacement was recorded in the operating accounts but was recorded as maintenance. So, it was generally the case that information was not available on the past and current cost of replacement and refurbishment of assets.

There was one exception to that, namely, the Highways Department, which estimated in its now new corporate plans the development and replacement components of its works programs. As the object of the exercise was to determine whether there was a problem with the so-called lumpy replacement in future years, only assets which were deemed to be replaceable were examined by the committee. For instance, land, which is not replaceable, was not considered in this exercise. Some assets, such as the rail track of the State Transport Authority, were considered to be continuously replaced, with maintenance expenditure each year being approximately equal to the amount of wear and tear. Maintained in this way, these assets never need replacing in a large lump and, therefore, do not create the kind of problems that the committee was trying to anticipate.

I want to talk for a little while about the term 'assets', because it is a simplistic term that covers a great multitude of usages, and one should not be confused by those uses. For instance, when an old asset is replaced it is frequently not replaced with an identical item but rather with its modern updated equivalent. After all, we are no longer using the X-ray machinery of 1910.

The committee took the view that it is not the replacement of assets but the replacement of the function of the assets that was important. This allowed for the replacement of assets because of obsolescence and changing functional requirements. An asset may perform several functions during its lifetime. For example, base load electricity generating plant is downgraded over its lifetime to mid-range load, to peak load and finally to rare, emergency usage. A movement from one function to another creates, in effect, a different asset and a replacement is needed to cover the initial function.

Further, the notion of an asset as a single entity which provides useful service until it is replaced is not an adequate notion, and it is certainly not adequate for complex assets such as hospitals, schools and even public housing.

The life cycle replacement model that was developed by the committee to deal with this complexity included a list of the components of the assets (such as superstructure, fittings, services, etc.) of which the asset was comprised, together with the percentage of the original cost that could be attributed to each component. Complex assets required the subdivision of components according to the life expectancy of different sub-elements of the component. The model calculates the proportion of the original cost (in real terms) falling due for replacement as time progresses, in nominal five-year periods. By incorporating information on the age structure and the current replacement value of the asset stocks, a projection can be made of the predicted future cost of replacement of the asset, if it is to be retained in service for the whole of the projection period.

Current technology was assumed constant throughout the study, as were current standards of service provision, as evidenced by both the policy and practice of agencies. The current technology assumption is in fact one with which it is possible to quarrel, and one may ascribe a particular percentage of saving on the basis that a new technology does in fact provide cheaper assets. Indeed, I understand that in some countries the percentage is incorrectly used, in my opinion, as a balancing agent between how much replacement would cost and how much money one has available to replace the item.

A common misunderstanding was to view buildings as lasting forever, and the committee ran up against that time and time again. Certainly, parts of buildings last for a long time, especially the outer shells, the foundations, the walls and the roofing structure. In fact, the cost of replacing the outer shell of the building is not the most significant factor in the replacement cost of that building. It is not generally known but is nevertheless true that, even if we were to assume that the walls, the foundations and the basic roofing structure of a building lasted forever, then the repetitive replacement of the shorter lived elements is still such that the building cost has to be met every 50 years or so. The replaceable elements, that is, the windows, the roofing, fabric, finishes, carpentry, utilities, floor coverings, fences and so on, individually have life expectancies of between 15 to 75 years. It is only when full account is taken of these components with a shorter life together with any upgrading (some of which might replace the outer shell of the building) that the replacement picture becomes somewhat clearer.

Unfortunately, replacement costs frequently are not identified in most systems of accounting. While large scale reconstruction usually rates a specific mention in the accounts (but usually without any separation of the associated components), ordinary component replacement frequently is lost under the heading 'Maintenance'. It may be this lack of clear identification of replacement that gives rise to the often heard statement, 'Our houses (or buildings or any other asset) will last forever if they are properly maintained.' Really, one needs to look at that sentence a little differently and to read it as, 'Our houses (structures or whatever) will last forever if they are replaced constantly, albeit in a piecemeal fashion.' One then begins to see the source of general confusion that exists between the need to replace components and the concept that buildings last forever. In some areas it has been known as the 1 000 year axe syndrome and that refers to the axe that has had 237 new handles and 150 new heads, but it is still the same axe.

Maintenance may be subclassified into routine or preventative maintenance such as painting, oiling locks, servicing equipment, etc., or it may be called corrective or programmed maintenance that consists of replacing the boilers, renewing the electrical wiring, etc. The actual nomenclature tends to vary between agencies. While routine maintenance expenditure tends to be more or less constant, at least in the short term, the second category of maintenance tends to be lumpy in nature in that, for a long time, one does not have to replace anything and then, all of a sudden, the boilers have to be replaced and it is a very large lump of expenditure. This form of lumpy maintenance is usually higher in capital content than routine maintenance and it is that component of maintenance that the Public Accounts Committee tried to bring to book during its inquiry. For instance, for the most part, the replacement of public housing does not mean bringing in the bulldozers, levelling the ground and starting again. If that were so, it would be at least much more easily identified. Rather, it means the replacement of individual components and various upgradings.

A literature study showed the Public Accounts Committee that this problem of infrastructure decay or infrastructure replacement had not been studied and reported upon in Australia and that there had been very serious problems of infrastructure decay in other countries. During the course of this inquiry the committee took particular note of problems that had occurred in the United States and the United Kingdom. In May and June of 1986 I studied infrastructure decay and infrastructure management in North America, the United Kingdom and Holland whilst on a private mem-

ber's study tour. Particular examples of the problems that these people in other countries ran into are legion and it might be very instructive to point to some of them.

For instance, in New York the deferral of maintenance of the water supply during the mid 1970s caused an increase of deterioration and leakage and each day New York now loses 10 per cent of its water supply before the water gets to the taps. In one case water got under the foundations of a very tall building in the garment district and the city of New York is now being sued by the owners of that building for the sum of \$2 000 million.

In the northern hemisphere winter of 1986-87, four reservoirs in the north of London ran dry as burst mains and pipes drained half the water supply before it got to the taps. Sections of sewer mains have collapsed in Manchester and Liverpool. In the United Kingdom a fatal gas explosion was investigated and was found to have occurred because gas leaked out of pipes below a building and exploded, causing the building to collapse, killing a number of people in the process. The authorities decided that in those circumstances they had better have a look at most of their pipes. I actually spoke to an engineer who found that in the case of one pipe the metal had totally corroded away; the pipe no longer existed and gas was moving through a cylindrical hole in the clay and had been for some considerable time.

Several East River bridges in New York have had their traffic flow restricted. One bridge, which was able to carry four lanes of traffic and four subway trains, is now allowed to carry only two subway trains, and when a single train passes over the bridge flexes half a metre. When I spoke to the city engineers and asked them how much farther the bridge could flex before it would lose its elasticity and start to sag and break, they said, 'That is the trouble, we don't know.' An elevated section of the Miller Highway collapsed in mid-town Manhattan, fortunately in that case without loss of life. In the US, the percentage of miles of interstate highways in poor condition more than doubled in the period of 1978 to 1980. The Controller-General of the United States reported to Congress that:

Billions of dollars will be needed to preserve these roads and if timely action is not taken deterioration will accelerate and even more money will be needed for reconstruction.

In 1980, 25 per cent of the bridges in the north-east of the United States were reported to be structurally deficient.

One of the problems that the committee found was that the required information for these reports could not simply be obtained by asking for it. There was no point in asking, 'What is the age of each of your assets, its economic life and its replacement cost expressed in constant dollar terms?'—say, 1985 dollar terms. To obtain useful information the ideas underpinning the inquiry had to be described to personnel in government agencies—indeed just as I have very briefly described them here. We were not just seeking information; we were dealing with new ideas, a new way of thinking about asset management information.

In fact, early off the record responses to the committee frequently indicated that the committee was believed to be on the wrong track. There had been no such problems in South Australia in the past and no such problems were foreseen. In passing, it may be useful to indicate why no such problem had been faced previously. In a rapidly growing State, such as South Australia at that time, by the time an echo occurred, it had been overtaken by much larger events and in fact a number of, say, sewage pipes which were to provide for a much smaller population had to be replaced in order to provide sewerage facilities for a much larger population and the small beer of earlier replacement echoes was in fact absorbed within the new growing infrastructure.

I now turn to the major findings of the inquiry. The total asset replacement that is projected to fall due in the next 50 years is given in a table, and I seek leave, Mr Deputy Speaker, to incorporate that table in *Hansard* without my reading it.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Can the honourable member assure me that it is purely statistical?

Mr KLUNDER: Yes, Sir, I can.

Leave granted.

**TOTAL PROJECTED REPLACEMENT EXPENDITURE
AND ACTUAL EXPENDITURE 1981-1985**
5 Year period ending Replacement expenditure in 1985 dollars

	\$m	Actual
1985	800	
1990	1 200	projected
1995	1 800	projected
2000	2 200	projected
2005	2 300	projected
2010	3 000	projected
2015	2 500	projected
2020	1 800	projected
2025	2 200	projected
2030	2 700	projected
2035	2 100	projected

Mr KLUNDER: The table shows that replacement is due to increase sharply over the next decade and that it will continue to grow until about the year 2010. It is then expected to fall back a bit. However, the average level in the second half of the period is still over twice as high as the current replacement activity. Clearly, the reliability of data decreases with time, and the past 25 years have been included more for the sake of completeness than in the expectation of accuracy.

The 50-year projection has been used to show that replacement is never likely again to fall as low as the current level; in fact we are in a honeymoon period with regard to the situation. It is interesting to note that prior to 1945 (just to give some idea of the replacement echo that will now occur—we reached a replacement echo of pre-1945 some 15 to 20 years ago) but prior to 1945 there was no five-year period where more than \$500 million worth of new assets were constructed. Since the war the average for the five year periods has been of the order of \$2 000 million.

Current replacement expenditure in itself is not necessarily a good indicator of future expenditure, either for a given agency or even across agencies as the amounts can vary accordingly. Transport, for instance, has only 2.2 per cent of the total replacement value of assets in the State, but it is currently accounting for 15.6 per cent of the replacement spending. Transport is in fact going through a hump of replacement activity and this is expected to fall in future years. The replacement costs for water and sewer assets, for instance, will increase markedly in future years.

The committee found that a reason why there had been no indication of the growing problem of future assets replacements was that information is generally not published in the public accounts of this State on the value of the assets stock and the annual expense of depreciation of assets. The committee therefore recommended that there be a move from cash accounting to accrual accounting for all those Government agencies which had not already done so; that depreciation of assets had to be calculated on the basis of current replacement costs; and that a balance sheet needed to be produced and published.

When I reconsider the advice I heard, in all the countries that I visited, from senior executives who were at that time in a crisis management situation with their replacement

problems, the common wish was that they had had some degree of warning that it was going to happen, and in each case when I spoke to them when the asset replacement crisis came on them without warning their first step was to cut back on routine maintenance. They stopped painting bridges, they stopped repairing potholes in roads, and in each case the actual problem that the replacement situation had engendered started to increase exponentially instead of merely increasing in a normal fashion.

A major benefit of the South Australian Public Accounts Committee's inquiry has been the warning that we have been able to give with up to 10 years lead time for planning and preparation. Of course there have been other benefits. An intense study such as this across many Government agencies provides an excellent opportunity for the examination of decision making and accountability. Issues of concern to the committees were a major element of each of the specific agency reports and the summary report, but I will not be able to deal with them in the time available to me here.

The committee identified the need for a major change of attitude towards assets. There was a need for managements at the most senior as well as middle ranks to become asset managers. In the past there have been two archetypal groups. They have been the asset users, such as education, welfare, police, hospitals, and the asset constructors such as Housing and Construction, Highways, E&WS, Electricity Trust, Housing Trust, etc. The asset constructors have tended to find construction solutions to every single problem, even if administrative solutions such as demand management might have been more appropriate. In a way, of course, you cannot blame them. If all you have got is a hammer then it would be nice if all your problems looked like nails. While this was generally the case, there have been notable exceptions. The Electricity Trust and the Engineering and Water Supply Department, for instance, have both been involved in at least some demand management solutions.

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr KLUNDER: If the honourable member wants me to be comprehensive, he will have to give me unlimited time and I will take him through all eight of the reports. As a step towards improving asset management, the committee recommended that attention be given to the long-run cost of refurbishment at the time of the construction of new assets. I must issue a warning here: there is for any given budget size a limit to the asset stock which can be sustained in the long term, and we are getting very close to that level. This means that, if we are going to add new assets, we will have to abandon some old ones, possibly reducing or eliminating the Government services that those assets were providing.

The role of the Commonwealth Government in providing specific purpose grants for certain capital works has had significant consequences when those assets have fallen due for replacement. In the United States the Federal Government has had to switch some of its States grants funds from new asset construction grants to replacement and refurbishment grants as some of the States were building new roads alongside old ones because those States that were getting grants only to build new roads found that it was cheaper to build them next to the old ones rather than refurbishing the old ones, which would have been cheaper for the taxpayer. The longer we delay that kind of switching of funds in Australia the worse our future asset replacement will become. The Commonwealth should be involved in, and asked to contribute to, the replacement of assets which originated through Commonwealth grants where it is deemed necessary that those assets be replaced.

As far as the committee can determine, funds are available for asset replacement if appropriate switching occurs at both State and Federal level. The level of replacement funding required is not yet higher than the States capital budget. Allocation of funds will not only have to occur from new work to replacement work but also between agencies which have different peaks and troughs in asset replacement falling due.

I refer also to their scope for reducing the size of the problem, which can be achieved by reducing the asset stock by rationalisation, for instance, in health and education, by extending the life of existing assets and by developing cheaper methods for replacing aged assets, which require research and development, and by reviewing the standards of those assets. It is pleasing to the committee that the issue of asset replacement has been taken as seriously as we believe it should have been taken. Senior managers in other States have informed me that relevant copies of our reports are required reading for their senior management.

Members interjecting:

Mr KLUNDER: Wait for it. I understand that media interest has been shown as far away as London. A working party has been set up in South Australia to examine the consequences of asset replacement requirements. Information comes first. The Public Accounts Committee of this State has, in fact, been able to give this State that necessary breathing space for planning, looking at the problem and trying to solve it in the long term rather than by crisis management.

Mr GUNN (Eyre): I am happy to support the motion. I think that this is the seventeenth occasion on which I have had the pleasure of taking part in an Address in Reply debate. I look forward to making many more speeches in this House, but from the other side.

Mr Robertson: You'll be welcome: we will sign you up immediately.

Mr GUNN: The honourable member will not be here, so he will not have that pleasure. He is one of the temporary members. I was right the last time I said this to the member for Todd, who had a period in the wilderness. The way things are going, I understand that the honourable member will have another period there. However, that is somewhat off the track of what I wanted to say this evening.

I add my condolences to the families of the Hon. Don Simmons and the Hon. Ron Loveday. For a number of years, the Hon. Ron Loveday farmed an area in my electorate about 45 kilometres from where I live. I quite often drive past that area and some of the old sheds are still standing. He had a connection with the electorate of Eyre at Cungi, and I knew him. He was involved in agricultural politics early in his career before he shifted to Whyalla. The Hon. Don Simmons came into the House at the same time as I did and made considerable progress, represented his area well and fought for the things that he believed in, although his particular philosophy was contrary to that of members on this side of the Chamber.

The economic situation in South Australia and the nation as a whole should be causing concern to every member of this Chamber. The difficulties that we face will be solved only if Governments are prepared to grasp the nettle and take the difficult decisions. The community at large is prepared to accept that Governments must take firm action. If we are to resolve our balance of payments problem, reduce unemployment and reduce interest rates, some very firm action must be taken by Governments.

First, we must recognise very clearly that we should not go round the country raising the expectations of the com-

munity. We must be prepared to say to groups and organisations that it is not possible for the Government to provide money or to give grants to rescue those organisations because, unless we show some lead, the community will continue to expect the Government to play Father Christmas. That has been going on for too long.

Mr Hamilton: What about rural assistance?

Mr GUNN: I am coming to that; just listen. If the honourable member has not spoken yet, he will have his chance.

Mr Hamilton interjecting:

Mr GUNN: I will. If Governments continue to spend money in non-productive areas or to appease groups there will not be adequate funds available to direct into necessary areas or to provide the sort of incentives and taxation measures that are necessary to get industry moving in this State. No matter what any of us in this place want to do for our electorates or for the population at large, we must be aware that the first thing that is needed is a strong economy. There must be growth, and people must be encouraged to invest and to develop. We must be able to produce goods that can be placed on the international market at competitive rates.

Australia has relied upon its mining and agricultural industries to sustain the nation. Those two industries built Australia and, if they are given a fair go and if common-sense prevails, they will keep the nation. Because of the difficulties with labour costs, Australia does not have, and it is most unlikely that it ever will have, a manufacturing industry that will provide the funds to generate enough employment. Agriculture and mining still have that ability. The community at large can see very quickly what happens when there is a downturn in the price of coal. Any responsible person should feel sorry for what has happened to the coalminers. The balance of payments follows the downturn in price and, when the price of wheat crashes, the results can be seen. Suddenly, even the Commonwealth Government has recognised the effect of those two major contributing factors on the welfare of the country. When they crash, the nation totters economically.

What must take place to assist those industries? First, there must be recognition on behalf of the employees and the unions that the demands that they make must be reasonable. We must all lift our productivity because, unfortunately, Australia competes on an international market which has an abundance of minerals and primary products. Unless Australia recognises those factors, it will continue to go downhill. We have all seen what has happened in the motor car industry, which is an important segment of the economy of South Australia. Because of unnecessary taxes and the fall in the dollar, the market dropped suddenly. In agriculture, Australia is faced with a quite ridiculous subsidy war between the EEC and the United States.

In Australia we have had the most efficient agricultural producers in the world, and they have been able to maintain that lead in the community because, until a few years ago, we had a sensible system of taxation and responsible system of orderly marketing of primary products. The taxation system encouraged people to invest in new technology and efficient plant and equipment, and the investment allowances and accelerated depreciation allowances did two things: they sustained local industry in country towns, machinery agents and repairing facilities, and provided for a machinery manufacturing section of the economy in South Australia and Australia, and much of that, unfortunately, has now collapsed.

Shearers and Horwood Bagshaw are about the only ones left. We used to have the International Harvester company and other people manufacturing tractors, and they have

gone. The taxation system was a very important incentive to agriculture, because the improved farming techniques and the technology the farmers used allowed us to put our products on the market at a very competitive price.

The other thing we had was a system of orderly marketing, which guaranteed a high quality product that could be put on the international market, and we could guarantee not only supply but quality, and could also guarantee to supply on time. They were very significant factors in the success of our agriculture. Even today, we have exported more wheat than ever in the history of this country. Unfortunately, of course, the return to the nation is down considerably.

I spoke today to a representative of the Wheat Board who said, 'Well, wheat will probably be \$130 a tonne next year, so the farmer will be lucky to get \$100 a tonne for that.' That is first advance. By the time we take off handling charges, wharfage fees, bulk handling and storage costs from \$100 a tonne and when we have an increase in fuel costs and the massive costs involved in chemicals, then that \$100, unfortunately, does not go very far.

Ms Gayler interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Mr GUNN: I will come to that. The real income earner and the thing which could quickly put people back on their feet in the mixed agricultural area was reasonable grain prices, particularly in the higher rainfall areas where people with a bit of luck could grow, say, a tonne of wheat to the acre and could generate in six to eight months a good return, because in most cases they had the stock and plant. The situation was not the same then as it is now.

If one tries to get into the grazing industry today and wants to go out and buy 2 000 or 3 000 sheep, they have virtually got gold in their teeth. They are so expensive that it is difficult to get into the industry: the outlay is so great that there will be no profit in it. One really cannot pay \$25 a head for bare shorn sheep.

The grain industry has provided to the nation a great deal of income and employment because we have been efficient. One of the unfortunate things has been that people have not understood the system of orderly marketing we have had in this country. The debates we have had with the South Australian Minister of Agriculture over eggs and other things (and we are having now over milk) are clear recognition that the Minister and his advisers—not the departmental officers: they understand—are not realistic and do not understand. I would like to just—

Ms Gayler interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Mr GUNN: I would like to explain to the House just what is taking place overseas, and to see the sort of problems which this country is facing from subsidies. World wheat prices have fallen by 50 per cent and stocks have risen by 70 per cent in the past couple of years. World sugar prices are down 80 per cent and stockpiles are up 45 per cent. Butter prices have fallen 50 per cent and stocks have increased to 1.7 million tonnes. EEC beef stocks have risen to over 600 000 tonnes—about three times its usual level. Feed grains, rice and oilseeds have suffered a similar situation. Direct farm program costs have risen enormously in the United States from between \$3 billion and \$5 billion early in this decade to around \$26 billion. In the EEC, costs have doubled, and in the past five years they have reached \$23 billion. Direct farm program costs in the United States of America have risen to around \$26 billion. Taxpayer subsidies and consumer transfers are costing more than \$900 each year for a non-farming family in the United

States. That is the sort of problem faced by the rural producers in this country.

We have not had subsidies in the past and we do not require them. It is a crazy situation to continue to go down the road of ongoing subsidies. A central system of orderly marketing can help even out ups and downs in the market. It can guarantee quality and give a producer a return based on his cost of production. That is a sensible arrangement. This country's policy has allowed us to compete without the sort of outrageous subsidy programs to which I have just referred. Agriculture has done a lot for this nation and there is a lot more that it can do. The farming community and those people living in it are experiencing great difficulties. A newspaper article headed, 'Farmers facing a survival year' appeared just before the annual general meeting of the United Farmers and Stockowners of this State. The article stated:

Australia's rural industry faced another year of struggle for survival despite improved prospects in some commodity areas, according to UF and S Chief Executive Mr Grant Andrews.

If one looks at the level of debts and what has happened with land prices, one cannot help but be concerned.

An unfortunate aspect of high interest rates is that many people who are trying to improve their operations—people with initiative and enterprise, those people who live in up and coming, go ahead farming communities—have expanded and many of them have really been caught. They purchased adjoining properties when interest rates were 12 per cent or 14 per cent but, within a few months, they found themselves paying 21 per cent. That is bad enough, but the value of the land has fallen by 50 per cent and, therefore, they have an equity problem with the bank. Many of them were placed in a difficult situation and could have faced bankruptcy. The member for Flinders would know, as I do, many sad examples where people have been placed in difficult circumstances. I seek leave to incorporate in *Hansard* a set of tables prepared by the Bureau of Agricultural Economics.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Can the honourable member assure me that the table is purely statistical?

Mr GUNN: Yes, Mr Deputy Speaker.

Leave granted.

10. Change in real land values June 1985 to June 1987

	Pastoral zone %	Wheat-sheep zone %	High rainfall zone %
New South Wales	-22	-34	-18
Victoria		-32	-18
Queensland	9	-47	-16
Western Australia	-31	-47	-39
South Australia	-1	-8	-16
Tasmania			-7
Northern Territory	17		
All States	4	-39	-20

11. Family farms with negative farm incomes

Industry	1979 -80 %	1980 -81 %	1981 -82 %	1982 -83 %	1983 -84 %	1984 -85 %	1985 -86 %	1986 -87 %
Wheat and other crops	15	16	17	66	20	38	55	48
Mixed livestock—crops	8	20	19	54	18	22	30	42
Sheep	15	21	32	51	27	21	32	10
Beef	16	29	33	53	32	29	32	25
Sheep-beef	21	28	31	61	30	18	29	20
Dairy	10	7	12	23	10	28	25	25
Horticulture	na	25	31	32	35	40	34	36
All surveyed industries *	13	20	24	50	22	25	32	30

* Broadacre, dairy and horticulture. na Not available.

Mr GUNN: The tables clearly indicate to the House—
Mr Hamilton interjecting:

Mr GUNN: I am a charitable fellow and I am in a very good mood. I will be very pleased to do that, because I am concerned to make sure that the House clearly understands the difficulties faced by the farming community and agriculture in general in this State. If there is no recognition by the Government and it is not prepared to play its role, unfortunately the community at large will suffer. I am concerned about the economic policies which are unnecessarily increasing interest rates. When people find their interest bills suddenly doubling within a matter of a few weeks, the Government and the nation as a whole should be concerned.

In my electorate and in the electorate of the member for Flinders some people have experienced difficult times. Many people have made application for assistance under the Rural Industries Assistance Scheme. That scheme has worked well, although many aspects of it need to be improved. People involved in the administration of schemes of this type

should have general banking experience, particularly in relation to cases where assistance cannot be made available. It is terribly important that people are available to visit those farms and clearly explain the situation and their options and endeavour to guide them in the right direction. Many people who are refused assistance have nowhere to go and do not know what to do. There have been some very sad cases. With a little bit of consideration those difficulties could be overcome.

My electorate has seen many interesting developments. During a recent visit to the Far North of South Australia a number of my colleagues and I observed at first hand the excellent role of the South Australian Police Force in the Pitjantjatjara lands. Of all State Government programs I have seen in my time as a member of Parliament this is one of the best for Aboriginal areas. The officers display a great deal of commonsense and conduct themselves in a manner which is a credit to the Police Force and to all people associated with the training of police aids. My only criticism is that I understand that the scheme will be com-

pleted at the end of this year. That will be a disaster in my opinion, because the Police Force has set an example and has put in place a standard that all other State Government departments should follow. It has displayed all the characteristics that State Government officers should have.

Ms Gayler interjecting:

Mr GUNN: I want police aids to be able to fulfil the important role that that scheme has in mind for them. It would be an absolute disaster if those police aids are left to their own devices without the proper support, back-up and assistance of the Police Force. If we withdraw those police officers too early, the scheme will fail. With all the best will in the world one has to face reality and use commonsense. The scheme has a great deal going for it. One cannot criticise the officers selected; we could not get better people. No-one could be critical of them. They have set an example for all other people involved in Aboriginal areas. It is my view that, unless that ongoing support is there at first hand, the scheme will founder. It is far better to retain these people, or other people within the Police Department who can play the same role. However, each of the communities we visited wanted the police to remain for a longer period. It would be a pity if, having done so much good and having spent a considerable amount of money, we allowed the scheme to falter because of a budgetary problem.

I was also concerned to see police officers using old hand-me-down vehicles that would normally be disposed of. A Government officer involved in sewerage works inspection arrived in a brand new Toyota fitted out with the latest radio and other equipment, whereas the police on the lands do not even have radios in their vehicles. Talk about a waste of Government resources—this Government officer was driving an expensive Toyota worth about \$50 000 and set up with radios while the police on patrol do not even have radios in their vehicles. If ever there was a misdirection of Government facilities, that was a clear example of it. It amazes me that the police vehicles in that area were a lot older than those which the Government normally has and were not even equipped—

Ms Gayler: Not the ones we saw. They were new.

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

Mr GUNN: I do not know where the honourable member was. I know that area pretty well and—

Ms Gayler interjecting:

Mr GUNN: We went to Ernabella, Kenmore Park and Amata, and we had discussions with the people. They had old Toyotas, not the current models. I have a little bit of knowledge about Toyotas, having owned a few and driven a lot. The person from the Department of Housing and Construction had a brand new Toyota when he could have used a Commodore or Suzuki. This was a misdirection of Government resources, and anyone who was there would know that.

This Government claims that it is promoting tourism in this State, yet one of my constituents employing 56 people and providing an excellent service to the community is paying the highest rate for electricity anywhere in this State. He is facing economic difficulties because of Government taxes and charges. Another of my constituents had to relocate because of the realignment of the Stuart Highway (although he had no complaints about that). This person has been given the run-around by the Department of Lands and the Highways Department. I will take the House through some of these events because they demonstrate bureaucracy at its worst.

Some time ago this person shifted from his previous locality to Kenmore Park. When he applied for a block of

land he was told that he could have a particular site. As he was about to build his tank a Highways Department officer told him that he could not build it there and had to go elsewhere, so he shifted. He got a different block set up and was then told that he could not have access. He explained that he was given this block but was informed that he would have to pay for access. I thought that we were meant to be encouraging tourism! This constituent still does not have an annual licence or a miscellaneous lease. He has applied for them, but because of the bureaucracy and nonsense that has been involved nothing has eventuated. One would think that he was trying to purchase the Crown jewels or that there was a shortage of land. My constituent only wants about 2.5 to 3 hectares. He has received no help from the Government and has had to provide his own water and electricity. He provides a service to the travelling public and employs six people. My constituent has built new facilities which were supplied from South Australia, and wants to extend his caravan park. As he has no title my constituent has no security to raise money from a bank. This matter has been continuing for years.

It is about time that the Minister of Lands, who is normally a most reasonable person, looked at this matter and did something about the red tape because it is interfering with people's livelihoods and preventing them from providing facilities for the travelling public. The tourism industry is booming in the North of South Australia and people want facilities. After arriving back at Coober Pedy I drove to Woomera to go to the American Independence Day celebrations and then drove up the back roads from Roxby Downs, coming out about 70 to 80 km north of Marree. On this Saturday night I was surprised at the number of people from buses and caravans camped on the side of the road.

These people need facilities, and this unfortunate constituent who wants to provide facilities is being impeded by red tape and bureaucracy. It is high time that Government action was taken to prevent this sort of nonsense. These hardworking people do not want Government assistance but, rather, want to be left to their own devices. Let them get on with making a living. It amazes me that they have to put up with these sorts of problems. To rectify the situation will not cost the Government anything. All they want is title on a pastoral lease in these hundreds of thousands of hectares of land on which there are no unique features.

My constituent merely wants a few pegs in the ground and a bit of paper, and he will provide the facilities. In conclusion, I sincerely hope that, in regard to these two matters, the Government will take some interest. I wrote to the Minister in charge of the police commending the Police Force on the manner in which police aides had operated and the excellent work which the South Australian Police had done in that area. I will be most concerned if that scheme is not continued as it is for at least another couple of years. I believe that if it is not continued there is a strong possibility that it will not be the success that we all want to see.

I repeat that, in my time as a member of Parliament, this scheme has been the most successful of any Government involvement in the Pitjantjatjara land. Every member of the House can be proud of the role that these officers have played. I would like an assurance from the Government that the good work that these officers have been involved in is not in any way to be jeopardised. I have much pleasure in supporting the motion.

Mr DeLAINE secured the adjournment of the debate.

ADJOURNMENT

The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT (Minister of Lands): I move:
That the House do now adjourn.

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK (Light): I am glad that you, Mr Deputy Speaker, are in the Chair, because I want to take very briefly as one of the three issues that I wish to raise this evening your comment made during the Address in Reply debate that it was important to consider the rights of others. I agree wholeheartedly with that philosophy: the rights of others are extremely important when one is considering the rights of those who are waving a stick at you or who are seeking to promote their particular point of view.

I found that this attitude was starting to come forth in the United States in relation to AIDS, and I will seek to contribute further to the debate on that vital issue in later sittings of the House. When I was in San Francisco I took the opportunity of spending time at the San Francisco General Hospital, in particular, in the AIDS Program Unit, which I believe the Minister of Health has more recently visited. The San Francisco General Hospital AIDS Panel is monitoring the situation in the whole of America. California has a large population, although by no means a preponderance, of AIDS sufferers.

It was indicated clearly that America is fast moving from the point where they believe that the rights of sufferers, which have been paramount in the past, are necessarily the rights that should maintain and that it is extremely important to protect the rights of the majority of the population who, in normal circumstances, would not expect to be infected but who are necessarily in a position of having to be protected from the wanton actions and activities of some sufferers.

For example, in Los Angeles, a person was charged with attempted murder on the basis that, knowing he had AIDS, he submitted himself for the donation of blood at \$10 a time on 23 occasions, without revealing to the persons to whom he was providing the blood that he was a sufferer of AIDS. It will be interesting to see what action the American courts take in relation to that matter. I found it staggering that, in the weekly update of known AIDS cases in America, to the end of May the number of AIDS sufferers in America was 36 000 and, regrettably, almost 21 000 of those 36 000 are dead already. The statistics go on to indicate that by 1991, just 10 years after AIDS was first identified in America, it is predicted that there will be about 240 000 full blown AIDS cases of which it is anticipated 207 000 will have died. They are staggering figures.

I believe it is only right that a community should begin to look at the rights of the remainder of the population in much the same way as you, Mr Deputy Speaker, expressed in relation to another matter. I hope that the Minister of Health, who has witnessed some of the activities of that unit, will introduce legislation or will bring substantive motions to the attention of both Houses so that we in South Australia can play a part, in a coordinated way with the rest of Australia, in the protection of the rights of the majority of people in this State.

In relation to an interest that I have had for many years, I draw to the attention of the House the comparison of the State electorate numbers in the 1985 State election and the 1987 Federal election. This material was provided by the Electoral Commissioner and indicates the variance that has taken place in that time. It is statistical material and I seek leave to have it inserted in *Hansard*.

Leave granted.

Comparison of State Electorate Numbers

18 November 1985-12 June 1987

Electorate	On Roll 18.11.85	On Roll 12.6.87	Variance Inc./Dec.	Percentage Variance	Relative Placement			
					On	Percent- age	On Nos	On Total
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Adelaide	19 116	19 855	739	3.87	Eq. 21	22		27
Albert Park	20 094	21 227	1 133	5.64	11	11		6
Alexandra	19 890	21 051	1 161	5.84	8	6		8
Baudin	20 066	21 446	1 380	6.88	4	4		4
Bragg	19 995	20 564	569	2.85	30	29		13
Briggs	18 158	19 298	1 140	6.29	5	Eq. 9		35
Bright	19 601	20 560	959	4.89	15	14		14
Chaffey	19 614	20 493	879	4.48	16	16		15
Coles	17 859	18 531	672	3.76	24	26		44
Custance	18 133	18 510	377	2.08	37	36		45
Davenport	18 730	19 270	540	2.88	29	32		36
Elizabeth	17 025	17 395	370	2.17	36	37		47
Eyre	17 676	17 928	252	1.43	42	44		46
Fisher	21 998	24 208	2 210	10.05	2	2		1
Flinders	18 901	18 998	97	0.51	46	46		39
Florey	19 449	20 978	1 529	7.86	3	3		9
Gilles	18 297	18 551	254	1.39	43	43		43
Goyder	20 923	21 543	620	2.96	28	28		3
Hanson	19 196	19 497	301	1.57	40	40		32
Hartley	19 402	19 944	542	2.79	32	31		24
Hayward	18 652	18 794	142	0.76	45	45		41
Henley Beach	19 790	20 322	532	2.69	33	33		19
Heyesen	19 089	20 241	1 152	6.03	7	7		22
Kavel	20 085	20 863	778	3.87	Eq. 21	19		11
Light	19 981	21 121	1 140	5.71	9	Eq. 9		7
Mawson	19 724	20 952	1 228	6.23	6	5		10
Mitcham	19 758	20 312	554	2.80	31	30		20
Mitchell	18 866	19 147	281	1.49	41	41		38
Morphett	18 683	19 160	477	2.55	35	35		37
Mount Gambier	18 742	19 731	989	5.28	Eq. 12	13		29
Murray-Mallee	19 662	19 919	257	1.31	44	42		25
Napier	18 156	18 826	670	3.69	Eq. 25	27		40

Electorate	On Roll 18.11.85	On Roll 12.6.87	Variance Inc./Dec.	Percentage Variance	Relative Placement		
					On Percent- age	On Nos	On Total
Newland	20 237	21 388	1 151	5.69	10	8	5
Norwood	18 826	19 765	939	4.99	14	15	28
Peake	19 668	20 475	807	4.10	18	18	Eq. 16
Playford	19 283	20 059	776	4.02	19	20	23
Price	19 905	20 639	734	3.69	Eq. 25	23	12
Ramsay	19 586	22 205	2 619	13.37	1	1	2
Ross Smith	19 177	19 489	312	1.63	39	39	33
Semaphore	18 934	19 676	742	3.92	20	21	31
Spence	19 554	20 254	700	3.58	27	25	21
Stuart	18 880	19 366	486	2.57	34	34	34
Todd	18 867	19 864	997	5.28	Eq. 12	12	26
Unley	19 576	20 436	860	4.39	17	17	18
Victoria	20 139	20 475	336	1.67	38	38	Eq. 16
Walsh	18 998	19 729	731	3.85	23	24	30
Whyalla	18 566	18 555	(11)	(0.06)	47	47	42
Totals	905 507	941 610	36 103				
Average	19 266	20 034	768	3.94			

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: Only one electorate has a negative value over the period and that is Whyalla. I also submit another small table that shows a comparison of the top score 12 electorates in the State. I seek leave to have that table inserted in *Hansard*.

Leave granted.

COMPARISON OF TOP SCORE 12 ELECTORATES
AS TO

Position	Total Numbers	Numbers Increase	Percentage Increase
	1	2	3
1.	Fisher	Ramsay	Ramsay
2.	Ramsay	Fisher	Fisher
3.	*Goyder	Florey	Florey
4.	Baudin	Baudin	Baudin
5.	Newland	Mawson	**Briggs
6.	Albert Park	Alexandra	Mawson
7.	Light	**Heysen	**Heysen
8.	Alexandra	Newland	Alexandra
9.	Florey	**Briggs	Light
		Light	
10.	Mawson	—	Newland
11.	*Kavel	Albert Park	Albert Park
12.	*Price	**Todd	*Mount Gambier **Todd

* Appear in one column only

** Appear in two columns only

Remainder appear in top 12 of each column

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: This document contains three columns and it indicates that nine of the top score 12 electorates appear in each of the top 12 positions, whether it be on total numbers, the increase by way of numbers, or on the increase by way of percentage. Whilst this does not really reveal what the position will be down the track, at least it gives an indication of the sorts of movements that are taking place in the electoral scene. Only four electorates appear once in the 12 top score columns showing some aberration.

The member for Eyre has spoken about bureaucracy and the incompetence shown in some departments. I want to very quickly refer to a matter in relation to the Department of Environment and Planning and heritage contracts for land and the refusal of felling rights for scrub. I have a copy of a letter dated 18 March from the department in

reply to a constituent who had asked for information concerning funding arrangements that he had entered into. This letter was not delivered, although the department advised either this man or his wife, both in the office and over the telephone on no less than five occasions, that the letter had been sent. When they called on 17 June protesting that they still had not received it, the document was drawn out of the file in their presence.

The officers of the department had said to this constituent that a decision had been made, that it was in writing and that he would just have to wait for it to turn up. Due to his persistence on 17 June it was drawn out of the file in his presence and the officers wanted to retain the letter so that they could change the date. That was not possible as he very wisely asked for the document to be given to him as it was. The department also has a responsibility to pay back to him part of the council rates and the lease payments that he paid in 1986-7. Although he has provided that information, the department, almost 10 months later, has still not paid those amounts.

Mr ROBERTSON (Bright): In September of last year during the previous session the member for Davenport—who took an early shower earlier today—raised what I regard as being a fairly ridiculous grandstanding private member's motion, in suggesting that members of Parliament should bid for their electorates and that, in effect, the electorate should go to the lowest bidder. At the time it was intriguing to ponder on what this might do to Party platforms and how various political Parties might be made accountable to the electorate. However, as ridiculous as it was, that motion had the saving grace that amongst the arguments presented in support of it the honourable member provided details of a number of wage levels of senior people in the Public Service and elsewhere. This raised in my mind the question of wage disparity, which has long been a concern of mine, and just for the purposes of starting somewhere it might be illustrative to begin with the figures used by the honourable member on that occasion and to point to some of the great disparities that occurred within the structure of the wage system at that time—that is, from the higher levels of the Public Service down to the very basic levels in various trades. I wish to put some of these figures on the record tonight. I stress that these figures are in fact from the latter part of last year.

The wage level at that time of a C7 engineer, a professional engineer of the kind employed by ETSA, was \$46 243; for the Executive Director of the Kindergarten Union it was \$63 000; for the Deputy Crown Solicitor of the Crown

Law Department it was \$64 000; the Crown Prosecutor, \$58 000; and \$37 000 for those on the AO3 scale in the clerical award. The honourable member went on to describe the levels of pay elsewhere in the Public Service: for an AO4 accountant, \$39 900 and the AO5 top salary was \$43 000. It is interesting to note that some months after that the *Adelaide News* ran a story of how the Queen had received a \$400 000 per annum pay rise, which on my figuring comes out to be about \$8 000 a week—altogether not a bad pay rise at all. However, that puts the other figures in some perspective, I suppose.

It is interesting, though, to compare these figures with the standard pay rates in a number of what are often considered to be tolerably well paid blue collar areas. Again, I use last year's figures for the purpose of comparison. Under the Metal Industry Award as at 1 July last year, somebody operating a dry ice machine, for example, was paid \$244.30 weekly.

There are a number of unclassified categories (for adults) in that award, ranging from \$243, or thereabouts, up to \$247. A person unlucky enough to be a 16-year-old apprentice got \$116.20 per week in the first year in the metal industry, and anyone unapprenticed and a junior (under 16) got \$81 a week—not exactly living high on the hog. The metals industry, it is interesting to note, is often seen as the pacesetter by conservative elements in our society. Metal awards are considered to be the pacesetter throughout industry, and it is generally figured that other awards follow. I must say there would not have been a great deal of difficulty following those.

I refer now to the Vehicle Industry Award (South Australia), again, as at 1 July last year. Referring to adults—and the award is categorised into groups—I suppose that detailing or car polishing is a fairly unskilled occupation but not one that I would particularly wish to trade with my own: the weekly rate was \$232.80. A junior (16 years and under) an assembler or a car spare parts salesperson received \$122.40, whilst a storeman or packer or a cleaner under the Vehicle Industry Award received \$110.60, which falls a fair way short of the Queen's weekly pay rise, as well as the wage levels in the upper echelons of the Public Service.

Under the Clerks Award (South Australia) as at 1 July last year, 16 years and under, a typist/switchboard attendant received a gross pay of \$137.20 up to, in the third year of adult service, \$288. Stenographers, machinists, etc., 16 years and under, received \$142.10 up to the top of the range, \$297.80. Clerks (Class 1), 16 years and under, received \$137.20 up to the fourth year and thereafter, \$295.50, top of the range. However long a person worked there, that is the top of the pay scale: \$295.50.

The Furnishing Trades Award is often said to be an award under which people are relatively well paid: the adult weekly rate for somebody sewing the material together on couches and lounge suites, and so on, was \$238.30. People in a rather specialised occupation within the furnishing trades (for example, an organ builder, organ metal pipe maker or an organ tuner) received \$280 per week. Picture framers received \$241.80, but if you were a junior under 17, you received the princely sum of \$107.30 per week. If you happened to be an apprentice, you did a little better. In the first year of your apprenticeship you received \$115.90.

The disparity between those rates of pay and the rates in the Public Service and, indeed, our own rate of pay in this place is quite mind boggling. I wish to take this opportunity to underscore that point by reading a letter written to me by a truck driver working for a local council in our neck of the woods; this will give the House and the general public some idea of the frustration and the difficulty faced by

people trying to live on wage rates of the kind to which I have referred tonight. The letter begins:

Dear Sir,

Frustration leads to anguish and, if unrequited, to anger. So it is, Sir, that I write to point out the following figures relating to our household income. My fortnightly wage minus the medical tax, superannuation and union fees is \$492. From that we take \$240 for the mortgage, \$62 for an essential loan, \$10 for savings, \$140 for food, \$32 for petrol, a total of \$482 from the \$492, which leaves \$10. This \$10 is left over and from it we have to meet sundry expenses including car maintenance, electricity, gas, water, council rates, school fees, household maintenance and medical fee differences the gap.

It is absolutely ludicrous for anybody to face that range of costs on \$10 a fortnight: it is impossible to meet those sorts of needs on \$10 a fortnight. The writer continues:

I work for a local council as a truck driver. I earn what is considered an average wage. I have bought an average home and own an average car. If I am living an average life, considering all of the above, life seems to be fairly grim.

The correspondence ends on that rather pessimistic note. It is a fact that, despite the best intentions of Governments in this country since the war (and there have certainly been a number of years of Labor Government) substantial gaps still occur between the top of the range in the Public Service and private enterprise and people on the bottom of the pile.

It seems to me that we need to look again, still and constantly at containing the difference and containing some of the top wages if they are being paid at the expense of people at the bottom of the pile. We need to look at the public sector and private enterprise and to look perhaps again at Clyde Cameron's plateau indexation ideas of some 15 years ago. We need to endorse the two-tier indexation system. We need to stand behind and reinforce what has been done by the Federal Government in relation to the fringe benefits tax area, the assets test, and negative gearing abolition—all progressive things—but still the disparity exists.

Mr OSWALD (Morphett): I have received a copy of a letter from the Glenelg Residents Association Incorporated on its letterhead addressed to Mr Gavin Keneally, Minister of Transport. I wish to bring its contents to the attention of the House, after which I will address a few remarks to the Hon. Mr Keneally. The letter is headed 'Re widening of Tapleys Hill Road' and states:

Dear Mr Keneally,

The widening of Tapleys Hill Road, Glenelg North, has had a long-term plan for redevelopment with discussions over the last 15 years. Heavy industrial traffic and a huge volume of north-south metropolitan traffic use this road in either direction, and this road has become unsafe not only for semitrailers, motor cars, motor bikes and bicycles, but also for pedestrians, including children who cross to attend the St Leonards Primary School. Currently the single lane either direction with cars parked on either side, dropped water-table and deteriorated footpaths demands immediate upgrading to prevent the current bottleneck of traffic.

The plans are finalised and the community have accepted that this project in Glenelg must have high priority. Home owners whose homes will be demolished have already made arrangements for different accommodation. Many vehicles now use residential streets in Glenelg North, causing social dislocation on Patavalonga Frontage, King Street Bridge, and Adelphi Terrace, to site one alternative route now requiring traffic lights because of distorted usage.

Last year a semitrailer, attempting to stop near the corner of Brighton and Diagonal Roads, Glenelg, was overturned, spilling toxic material on the road at a point where schoolchildren cross in large numbers. Is not the school crossing on Diagonal Road near Brighton Road more dangerous than any one point on Ocean Boulevard, a road now excluded to heavy vehicular traffic?

On what grounds then, was Ocean Boulevard precluded from erect signs at both its boundaries precluding heavy traffic from roads just too below standard to cope with it.

Jubilee Point Pty Ltd, with debentures in SGIC, has offered to undertake 'alternatives', including road development, in Glenelg.

We would be very happy to see Jubilee Point Pty Ltd undertake the widening and realignment of Tapleys Hill Road, given the advantages to the community that this project will afford. At its special meeting of 27 July 1987 to plan a philosophy and some directions for Glenelg, residents of Glenelg asked me to notify you that the postponement of this approved plan can go on no longer.

Yours sincerely,
Raelene J. Telfer

Ms Telfer is Secretary of the Glenelg Residents Association.

For the benefit of the Government, I will summarise the concerns of local residents. First, they are concerned at the delays in the project. They are also concerned about the build-up of industrial traffic, including oil tankers, which has reached a totally unacceptable level in what is a very narrow, two lane urban arterial road. Members should understand that the two lanes must also accommodate the parking of the vehicles of local residents. The road is unsafe for motor cars, bicycles and pedestrians. It is most certainly unsafe for children and elderly people crossing the road. Admittedly there is a set of pedestrian traffic lights on one point along the road but it is a distance of several hundred metres from those pedestrian lights to the other set of lights, and that is too far for children and the elderly to walk. The Glenelg Residents Association and the Glenelg council, I might add, believe that oil tankers should be taken off Tapleys Hill Road.

A couple of weeks ago I had the pleasure of taking part in a deputation, together with the Mayor of the City of Glenelg and a selected number of aldermen and administrative staff, who had the opportunity of advising the Minister in person on some of the important problems that are being experienced in the area. I was pleased that the Deputy Commissioner of Highways was also present. The deputation was able to tell the Minister of its concerns about the future of Tapleys Hill Road at Glenelg North. However, the deputation was very disappointed to learn that the Government has put off the project. The Mayor of Glenelg specifically asked that the Minister and his department review the decision to delay the project any longer. He believes that the Government should reinstate the commencement date.

There is no doubt in my mind that Tapleys Hill Road at Glenelg North between Anzac Highway and Sturt Creek has developed into one of the major bottlenecks in Adelaide. An examination of the highway shows that, where it adjoins the Adelaide Airport, it is a four lane highway until it reaches the Sturt Creek bridge. At that point it narrows down to two lanes, and, as I said, local residents have to park on that. When the road reaches Anzac Highway, it swings sharply to the left onto Anzac Highway and takes a

sharp turn to the right and becomes Brighton Road, which is a four lane highway. It has four lanes at both ends and a two lane urban arterial in the centre, and that section becomes absolutely chaotic.

My concern, which is shared by others, is over the narrow lanes and the parked vehicles, which are ever present and which are ever causing hazards. I am concerned that the vehicles in the centre of the road waiting to turn right are accidents waiting to happen. I am concerned that drivers are using the residential streets adjacent to Tapleys Hill Road as an alternative thoroughfare, and the traffic density on these roads is starting to build up to intolerable levels.

The existing surface on the road is deteriorating and nothing is being done about it because the Highways Department eventually will pull up the surface and replace it. In the meantime, we have a deteriorating surface on the road, deteriorating kerbing and deteriorating drainage. We have an intolerable build-up of industrial traffic and of oil tankers, and I hope that the Minister will have due regard to my request and that of the council deputation to do something about these oil tankers. When they make right-hand turns from Anzac Highway into Tapleys Hill Road, with the weight of their load, many times we hold our breath waiting for something to happen.

Fortunately, nothing has happened there. It has certainly happened back at the Glenelg Primary School and the Diagonal Road intersection. It has not yet happened at Tapleys Hill Road, but we surely do not have to wait for a tanker to go over before action takes place. I have been trying to find out from successive Governments since 1980, what was to happen along Tapleys Hill Road: first, what the plan was and, secondly, when that plan would be implemented and completed.

Now that the Labor Government has decided to proceed with the reconstruction of Tapleys Hill Road into a four-lane highway, the residents have been notified, the elderly who have been there all their lives have adjusted to the fact that they will have to move, and properties are now being purchased by the department so that there is no question in people's minds that eventually it will happen, I must say that I know that the Glenelg Residents Association and the Glenelg council will be most unimpressed if the Government continues to delay the project. Indeed, it was the desire of both the association and the council that the priority on that project be reinstated and that the project get under way as early as possible.

Motion carried.

At 10.26 p.m. the House adjourned until Wednesday 12 August at 2 p.m.

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday 11 August 1987

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE**MICROELECTRONICS CENTRE**

15. **Mr OLSEN** (on notice) asked the Minister of State Development and Technology: Has the Government established a microelectronics applications centre as promised in the publication *South Australia's Economic Future—the Next Five Years* released by the Premier in August 1985 and, if so, where it is located, how many staff does it have and what was its budget for 1986-87 and if it has not been established, why not and is it still intended to establish such a centre?

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: Yes, the Adelaide Microelectronics Centre was established on 16 December 1985 as an arm of the Technology Park Adelaide Corporation. It is located at Technology Park and employs three full-time staff. The 1986-87 budget is \$250 000. A brochure on the Centre was mailed to all members of the State Parliament.

SOUTH AUSTRALIA INTERNATIONAL ORGANISATION

16. **Mr OLSEN** (on notice) asked the Premier: Has the Government established the South Australia International Organisation promised in the publication *South Australia's Economic Future—the Next Five Years* released by the Premier in August 1985 and, if so, who are the members of its Board of Directors, what are its objectives and what success has it had so far in meeting those objectives and if it has not yet been established, why not and is it still intended to establish such an organisation?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: Substantial progress has been made towards the creation of South Australia International. A number of options relating to its establishment have been considered and one has now been identified as promising. The Department of State Development is in the process of developing its final proposals for consideration by the Government.

INDUSTRY GRADUATE DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM

17. **Mr OLSEN** (on notice) asked the Minister of State Development and Technology: Has the Government established the Industry Graduate Development Program as promised in the publication *South Australia's Economic Future—the Next Five Years* released by the Premier in August 1985 and, if so, what funding was allocated to the program for the year 1986-87 and how many manufacturing firms have been provided with subsidised access to graduates for in-house research and development projects and if it has not been established, why not and is it still intended to establish such a program?

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: The proposal identified in the publication *South Australia's Economic Future—the Next Five Years* as the Industry Graduate Development Program has been established as the Teaching Company Scheme, operated as a State-level extension of the National Teaching Company Scheme. The program, administered by the Technology Park Adelaide Corporation, has an allocation of \$70 000 for 1986-87. Four manufacturing firms were assisted under the program in the first year of operation—1985-86. By the end of the present financial year a total of nine companies will be operating South Australian Government subsidised Teaching Company Scheme projects.