

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday 6 October 1987

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

ASSENT TO BILLS

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

Egg Industry Stabilisation Act Amendments,
Fisheries (Southern Zone Rock Lobster Fishery Rationalisation),
Justices Act Amendment,
Supply (No. 2).

LONG SERVICE LEAVE (BUILDING INDUSTRY) BILL

His Excellency the Governor, by message, recommended to the House of Assembly the appropriation of such amounts of money as might be required for the purposes mentioned in the Bill.

DEATH OF Hon. S.C. BEVAN

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

That this House express its regret at the recent death of the Hon. S.C. Bevan, former Minister of the Crown and member of the Legislative Council, and place on record its appreciation of his meritorious service; and that, as a mark of respect to his memory, the sitting of the House be suspended until the ringing of the bells.

It was sad to learn during the recent parliamentary break that Stanley Charles Bevan (Stan Bevan, as he was well known) died on 19 September. He was born on 14 October 1901 and therefore reached a distinguished age. Mr Bevan was a member of the Legislative Council for 19 years, from October 1951 to May 1970. This means that only two of our colleagues in this Chamber recall Stan Bevan as a member of Parliament, but many of us came into contact with him over the years and retain fond memories of him.

Stan Bevan always had a close link with people in Adelaide's western suburbs throughout his life. Educated in Thebarton, he worked as a timber machinist in Hindmarsh. He was married in the Queen of Angels Church at Thebarton, and raised three children in the family home in Mile End. When he celebrated his golden wedding anniversary in 1984, his address had not changed, nor had it changed at the date of his death. So, he was a man who, obviously, closely identified with that community and the aspirations of people in it. But his interests went very much wider than that. He was extremely active in the trade union and labour movement.

He emerged first as a public figure in 1942, when he was elected State Secretary of the Miscellaneous Workers Union. In 1947 he became Federal Secretary of that union, and held the post for a number of years, going on into the period that he was a member of the Legislative Council. In 1950, he represented Australia as a delegate to the International Labor Organisation in Geneva, and on two separate occasions during the 1950s he was elected President of the Trades and Labor Council. So, he had all of the honours that could be bestowed by that movement, and he held

major office, and had a great influence on the pattern of industrial relations through the 1940s and 1950s.

Within the ALP he served as a member of the State Executive for about 15 years and as Party President in 1952-53. As a member of the Legislative Council he served on a number of committees, including the Land Settlement Committee, the Subordinate Legislation Committee and, for a period, the Public Works Standing Committee. Having had over 13 years in Opposition in Parliament, it was not until 1965, at the age of 63 years, that he became a member of a Labor Government and, in fact, served in that Government as Minister of Local Government, Roads, and Mines.

During his three-year term as a Minister of the Crown the South-Eastern Freeway was built, as were the Jervois bridge and the Kingston bridge over the Murray. The south-western suburbs drainage scheme was begun and, as Minister of Mines, he was closely involved in development of the natural gas reserves and the pipeline project which was undertaken over those years.

He retired from Parliament in 1970, but certainly did not retire from involvement in the community. He followed many of his lifelong interests, including harness racing; he was a devotee of the West Torrens Football Club, and he had other hobbies, including the keeping of pet birds, as well as other interests. So, he was certainly a man who retained a tremendous appetite for life and activity. Having sketched the career of the Hon. Stan Bevan, I say on behalf of myself and my colleagues how sad we are that he has passed on. We certainly appreciate the contribution he made to public life and affairs in this State over so many years. To his widow Ida and their children Frank, Carmel and Marie, who all survive him, we extend our sympathy and condolences.

Mr OLSEN (Leader of the Opposition): I support the motion before the House, and I express the Liberal Party's condolences at the passing of Stan Bevan. As has already been said, he served as a member of the Legislative Council for almost 19 years, and for five of those years he was Minister responsible for the important portfolios of local government, roads, and mines. He also served as a member of the Industries Development Committee in the late 1960s, which, of course, was a very challenging time for the South Australian economy.

Whilst I did not have the opportunity to serve with or meet Stan Bevan in Parliament, colleagues of mine have advised me that he discharged his duties in both parliamentary and ministerial areas in a very serious and committed way. At one time he was one of only four ALP members in the Legislative Council. He showed his capacity for hard work and industry best during that period, as a member of the ALP front bench. Stan Bevan was devoted to the ALP and committed to its principles.

Even though he was from the other side of politics, I think it ought to be said that it is always good to witness, and subsequently acknowledge, those who show unshakable faith in their chosen political philosophy—and, more importantly, adhere to it. Therefore, I join with the Premier in expressing our regret at the death of Stan Bevan and ask that our condolences be passed on to his family.

Mr S.G. EVANS (Davenport): I agree with the comments made by the Premier and the Leader of the Opposition. I have been out of the State and am sorry that I did not know until today that Stan Bevan had passed on. On behalf of all Hills people I say thanks to Stan Bevan for the work he did in ensuring that the Hills freeway was taken further than first proposed so that it could serve the Hills community. I first met Stan Bevan just before I came into this

place. He possessed an important attribute for a member of Parliament, and particularly for a Minister: he was always accessible, being prepared to make himself available to meet constituents or other individuals if they had a problem.

That is not always the case with Ministers, so I would like Stan Bevan's family to know that I was grateful and those people from the Hills who had discussions with him were grateful that he was available to discuss matters of concern. He had no great educational qualifications, and held no degrees, but he had one important attribute—commonsense. He came from the trade union movement, and all sections must be represented here. He was a listener; he would consider the issue and answer after taking into account all the points one had made. I would like Mr Bevan's family to know that I and other Hills residents appreciated the sincerity, hard work, dedication, commonsense and accessibility that he brought to his ministerial position in serving the State.

The SPEAKER: I will ensure that the *Hansard* record of members' tributes relating to the death of Stan Bevan is forwarded to his family.

Motion carried by members standing in their places in silence.

[Sitting suspended from 2.13 to 2.20 p.m.]

PETITIONS: ELECTRONIC GAMING DEVICES

Petitions signed by 79 residents of South Australia praying that the House reject any measures to legalise the use of electronic gaming devices were presented by Messrs Bannon, Lewis, and Mayes.

Petitions received.

PETITION: PENALTIES FOR ARMED HOLD-UPS

A petition signed by 946 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Government to increase penalties for armed hold-ups and similar violent offences was presented by Mr Crafter.

Petition received.

PETITION: SENTENCE REMISSIONS

A petition signed by 518 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: GAWLER DRIVING TESTS

A petition signed by 108 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Government to restore the facility for practical driving tests at Gawler was presented by Mr Eastick.

Petition received.

PETITION: SEATON NEIGHBOURHOOD WATCH

A petition signed by 109 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Government to support the

introduction of the Neighbourhood Watch scheme to the Seaton area was presented by Mr Hamilton.

Petition received.

PETITION: TOYS

A petition signed by 324 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Government to ban the sale of toys encouraging violence was presented by Mr Lewis.

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 1, 7, 20, 30, 34, 39, 43, 44, 64, 81, 86 to 99, 102, 106, 107, 119, 135, 140, 150, 151, 155, 156, 159, 161, 162, 169 to 171, 181, 186, 197 to 200, 202, 205, 207, 257, 264, 268, 269, 275, 277, 280, 282 to 284, and 286; and I direct that the following answers to questions without notice be distributed and printed in *Hansard*.

CHILDHOOD SERVICES

In reply to the **Hon. H. ALLISON** (20 August).

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: The current proposed amendments to the regulations for child-care centres are the culmination of lengthy community consultation initiated by the Department for Community Welfare in 1984. All sectors interested in child-care have had opportunities to comment on any aspect of the proposed amendments. There has been strong support for the proposed changes from most sectors concerned with child-care. The amendments being proposed will not preclude people with a nursing qualification from being approved as trained. The Children's Services Office is aware of the particular circumstances of country centres, and the previous practice of dealing with these centres, in a flexible and supportive manner, will continue.

VEGETATION CLEARANCE

In reply to **Mr LEWIS** (19 August).

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: The Native Vegetation Authority met on Monday 24 August 1987. The Native Vegetation Management Act 1985 gives applicants the right to support their case in person before the authority and I am not aware of any applicant wishing to so appear being precluded from the meeting.

PAPERS TABLED

The following papers were laid on the table:

By the Premier (Hon. J.C. Bannon):

Department of the Premier and Cabinet—Report, 1986-87.

Government Management Board—Report, 1986-87.

By the Treasurer (Hon. J.C. Bannon):

Lotteries Commission of South Australia—Report, 1986-87.

Parliamentary Superannuation Fund—Report, 1986-87.

Treasury Department—Report, 1986-87.

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

Department for the Arts—Report, 1986-87.
 Carrick Hill Trust—Report, 1986-87.
 Adelaide Festival Centre Trust—Report, 1986-87.
 South Australian Film Corporation—Report, 1986-87.
 State Theatre Company of South Australia—Report, 1986-87.

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

National Parks and Wildlife Act 1972—Regulations—Attendance in Parks and Belair, Para Wirra and Seal Bay Parks Entrance Fees.
 Camping and Hiring Fees.
 Cleland Conservation Park Entrance Fees.
 Hunting Permit Fees.
 Wildlife Permit Fees.
 Planning Act 1982—Crown Development Report—Mobile Radio Network expansion on Eyre Peninsula by ETSA.

By the Minister of Emergency Services (Hon. D.J. Hopgood):

Firearms Act 1977—Regulation—Fees.

By the Minister of Lands (Hon. R.K. Abbott):

Advances to Settlers Act 1930—Balance Sheet and Revenue Statement.
 Geographical Names Board—Report, 1986-87.
 Department of Lands—Report, 1986-87.
 Crown Lands Act 1929—Return of Cancellation of Closer Settlement Lands, 1986-87.
 Pastoral Act 1936—Pastoral Improvements, 1986-87.

By the Minister of State Development and Technology (Hon. Lynn Arnold):

South Australian Council on Technological Change—Report, 1986.
 Small Business Corporation of South Australia—Report, 1986-87.
 Department of State Development and Technology—Report, 1986-87.

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

Office of Tertiary Education—Report, 1986-87.

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

Commissioners of Charitable Funds—Report, 1985-86.
 Local Government Superannuation Board—Report, 1985-86.
 Controlled Substances Advisory Council—Report, 1986-87.
 Highways Department—Report, 1986-87.
 Medical Board of South Australia—Report, 1986-87.
 Department of Services and Supply—Report, 1986-87.
 Department of Transport—Report, 1986-87.
 Local Government Act 1934—Regulation—Eastern Metropolitan Regional Health Authority.
 State Supply Act 1985—Regulation—Exemptions.
 State Transport Authority Act 1974—Regulation—Ticketing System.
 City of Burnside—By-law No. 10—Lodging Houses.
 City of Woodville—By-law No. 57—Poultry.
 District Council of Saddleworth and Auburn—By-law No. 21—Keeping of Dogs.

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

Corporate Affairs Commission—Report, 1986-87.
 Electoral Department—Report, 1986-87.
 Director-General of Education—Report, 1986.
 Teachers Registration Board of South Australia—Report, 1984.
 Hairdressers' Registration Board of South Australia—Report, 1985-86.
 Acts Republication Act 1967—Criminal Injuries Compensation Act 1978—Schedule of Alterations.
 Evidence Act 1929—Commissioner of Statute Revision.
 Local and District Criminal Courts Act 1926—District Criminal Court—Rules of Court—Exhibits and Fees.
 Supreme Court Act 1935—Rules of Court—Supreme Court—Costs.
 Builders Licensing Act 1986—Regulation—Roof Tiling Exemptions.
 Fair Trading Act 1987—Regulations—Door to Door Contracts and Forms.

Liquor Licensing Act 1985—Regulation—Prohibition of Minors.

Trade Standards Act 1979—Regulation—Flotation Toys and Swimming Aids.

By the Minister of Housing and Construction (Hon. T.H. Hemmings):

South Australian Housing Trust, Report, 1986-87—Supplement.

South Australian Housing Trust, Report, 1986-87—Supplement—Housing Trust in Focus.

By the Minister of Public Works (Hon. T.H. Hemmings):

Public Works Standing Committee Act 1927—Regulation—Travelling Expenses.

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

Industrial Court and Commission of South Australia—Report, 1986-87.

Long Service Leave (Building Industry) Board—Report, 1986-87.

Commissioner for Public Employment and the Department of Personnel and Industrial Relations—Report, 1986-87.

Workers Rehabilitation and Compensation Act 1986—Regulations—General Regulations, 1987—Reviews and Appeals.

By the Minister of Correctional Services (Hon. Frank Blevins):

Parole Board of South Australia—Report, 1986-87.

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

Seeds Act 1979—Regulation—Seed Testing Fees.

By the Minister of Recreation and Sport (Hon. M.K. Mayes):

Racecourses Development Board—Report, 1986-87.

South Australian Totalizator Agency Board—Report, 1986-87.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: LOS ANGELES TRADE OFFICE

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD (Minister of State Development and Technology): I seek leave to make a statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: The South Australian Government trade office in Los Angeles was closed last week following a major earthquake in that city. With some free-ways closed and power black-outs occurring, the Government's representative (Mr Ormsby Cooper) has been obliged to carry out the trade office's operations from his residence. No further news is available at this stage concerning the effect of the recent after-shock. Mr Cooper and his wife were unharmed during the earthquake and, since the first quake, both have left on a business trip to the East Coast of the United States. I will keep the House advised if there is any substantial alteration to the situation with respect to our trade office or its staff.

REGISTER OF MEMBERS' INTERESTS

The SPEAKER laid on the table the statement of the Registrar of Members' Interests for 1987.

Ordered that statement be printed.

JOINT PARLIAMENTARY SERVICES COMMITTEE

The SPEAKER laid on the table the first annual report of the Joint Parliamentary Services Committee.

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:

Finger Point Sewage Treatment Works (Revised Proposal) (Final Report),

Outback Interpretive Centre (Port Augusta).

Ordered that report be printed.

QUESTION TIME

BELAIR-BRIDGEWATER RAILWAY

Mr OLSEN: Did the Minister of Transport discuss with the Federal Minister for Land Transport (Mr Peter Duncan) a Bureau of Transport Economics report on the closure of the Belair to Bridgewater railway before that report was released and, if so, what were the discussions, when did they take place, and what was decided? Can the Minister of Transport explain why two copies of the report—a draft and a final report and dated only one day apart—contained significant differences and why both were made public?

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: To answer the last part of the Leader's question first, I point out that he should direct this question to either the Minister for Land Transport in Canberra or the Bureau of Transport Economics, because although the State Government asked for the report it was commissioned by the Federal Minister and was prepared by the Bureau of Transport Economics. I point out that copies of the final report have been sent to me, but this question should be directed to the Federal Minister for Land Transport because he commissioned it.

Mr Olsen interjecting:

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: The draft report was not released from my office. In fact, some of the journalists who had access to the report took the trouble to telephone me and reassure me that the report did not come from my office, so I totally reject the Leader's allegation. The Leader should check his sources because I am certain that if he did he would concur with what I have just said.

I did not discuss the report with the Minister for Land Transport, although on one occasion I did ask him whether he was involved in its preparation, and he told me that it was purely and simply a matter for the Bureau of Transport Economics—and I accepted that. Subsequent to receiving the report I had no discussions with the Minister for Land Transport, although I did meet him when he opened a transport convention in Adelaide last Monday week (I think). We were surrounded by many delegates at the convention and we did not discuss the matter at all.

WORKCOVER

Ms GAYLER: Will the Minister of Labour outline the Government's policy in relation to queries that have been raised about the new workers rehabilitation and compensation scheme known as WorkCover? Small business constituents in the Tea Tree Gully area have raised a series of queries with me, including problems with the hot line that was established and problems in getting information from WorkCover offices; queries about the level of premium or levy for small businesses in particular; the absence of a no-claim bonus applying at present for businesses (as was the case previously when, for example, a seven-year no-claim

bonus applied); and some are worried that they have received no confirmation—written or otherwise—that WorkCover now covers their employees. I understand that there have also been queries about the cover applying to domestic workers.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I thank the honourable member for her question and for the opportunity to correct some of the statements made by the Opposition and by some sections of the insurance industry.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I will deal with the issues in the order that they were put by the honourable member. In relation to the question of the levy and its rate, I point out that it is struck by the board and not by the Government, and the board consists of an equal number of trade union movement and employer representatives. The rate for the levy was a unanimous decision of those bodies. Some employers have said that the levy discriminates against small business and that their premiums have increased under the new scheme. The member for Mitcham has also made these comments.

The intention of the new scheme was made very clear indeed from the first day, in fact from the first day nine years ago. The intention was that the productive sections of the South Australian economy would, to some extent, be cross-subsidised by the other sectors of the economy. We make no apology for that whatsoever; in fact, we are very proud of it because, unless the productive sectors of the economy are profitable and are assisted to be profitable, there is no wealth to distribute, and that is what the service sector of our economy is about: distributing wealth, not principally about creating it.

In relation to the argument about big business and small business, by and large big business is not involved in the new scheme. Big business in this State for a long time has been self-insured. It has been estimated that about 60 per cent of the trade unionists affiliated to the Trades and Labor Council are covered by self-insurance. Almost without exception, the big firms are self-insurers, as is the State Government. When we talk about small business being discriminated against, whom are we talking about? We have in this State over 20 000 small businesses in the farming community, and farmers (as I have come to appreciate, and as the Minister of Agriculture has come to appreciate) have many fine qualities, but suffering in silence is not one of them.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: The same with seamen. There has been a deathly silence from the farming community and I will tell the House why. For example—and this I am sure will interest some of my friends opposite who have interests in the farming community—shearing rates have gone down from over 13 per cent of payroll to 4.5 per cent. So that covers over 20 000 small businesses who have benefited—and benefited extensively—from this legislation. The member for Coles, I recall, 12 months ago came into the Parliament complaining that shearing contractors in South Australia were being undercut by shearing contractors from Victoria who had the advantage of the Victorian WorkCare scheme. I agreed with her totally—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: We have fixed it. It is now the same, so there can be no complaint, either, from the member for Coles—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: We concede the service industries. I will touch on a couple of other issues that the honourable member raised. The first is the question of the

difficulty in getting through on the hot line on the last day available for registration. We have about 50 000 employers in this State, and although well over 40 000 of them registered in good time and have had confirmation, 6 000 of them wanted to turn up on the last day and get instant action. It does not work that way.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: The only way that could have operated was for us to hire a lot of casual staff, at great expense to employers (because that is all employers' money, not State Government money), to satisfy those 6 000 or so who wanted to turn up on the last day and register.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: They were not prepared to do that, and I support them strongly. There was extensive advertising in the electronic and print media for many weeks, and there is absolutely no excuse for any employer to turn up on the last day and expect instant action.

Regarding domestic workers, I have been amazed at the misrepresentation made by the member for Mitcham. Under the old scheme no domestic workers were covered for workers compensation. Some insurance companies covered them under household policies if requested, but overwhelmingly they did not request it and those working on a casual basis in a domestic relationship therefore had no cover at all. I did not hear the insurance industry complaining about that or promoting its insurance cover. I did not see full page advertisements or hear radio advertisements encouraging people to take out insurance cover for domestic employees.

So, for the industry now to be complaining about the people not covered strikes me as somewhat hypocritical. Today, overwhelmingly casual domestic workers are covered and, again, overwhelmingly they are covered at no cost to the employer. At present, the small percentage of casual workers who work fewer than five days a year are not covered. In the main they are self-employed people who go around South Australia doing small jobs. If those people do not have the wit to go to an insurance company for sick and accident insurance, that is a sorry state. However, as it seems that some of them are unable to, I am willing to consider whether I should lead this group by the hand and have them, too, covered in order to remove any argument.

It is a sorry state when people working at that level cannot go to an insurance company and obtain cover. Certainly, if they go to the State Government Insurance Commission they can obtain it. If householders go to the SGIC for cover they can get it, and they always have been able to get it. Some insurance companies have withdrawn from the field, and that is up to them, but I say to everyone, 'Go to the SGIC.'

Regarding no claim bonuses, once employers in this scheme have a history that the board and the actuaries who set the levy can test, and if it can be established that their rehabilitation facilities are adequate for sick and injured workers, they will be covered by the legislation. There will be penalties and discounts, with the necessary provision coming into force after 12 months or, at the latest, two years. So, that will be taken care of.

In conclusion, the new scheme is in, and all those people who said that it could not or should not be introduced have been proved wrong. The scheme is there and will remain, and it is up to everyone to make sure it works. That includes the Liberal Party, because the Liberal Party purports to support and represent employers. If it does not work, this State will be seriously disadvantaged. We have built in many safeguards, but we cannot build in support for the scheme and for the employers, whose money goes to the Liberal

Party. I hope that they now consider that they have discharged the debt, whatever that debt may have been, to the insurance industry which financed their 1984 mid-year campaign and the 1985 campaign. I hope that the Liberal Party gets behind the South Australian employers and behind the scheme so that for once we may see from the Opposition something positive in support of industry in this State.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: Following hundreds of anomalies and inequities that have become apparent with the introduction of WorkCover, will the Government immediately contact the board (after all, the Minister says that it is not his responsibility) and request it to review its refusal to consider previous work safety and claims records of employers when establishing WorkCover premiums. I seek your leave, Sir, to explain the question, notwithstanding what the Minister said just a moment ago.

The Hon. Frank Blevins interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: I did not quite catch the Minister's interjection, but I hope he will listen to what I have to say. As the Minister has pointed out to the House, the board's current intention is to establish WorkCover and to build up its own claims and safety records for the purposes of allowing a no-claims bonus. I hope that I can point out the problem that that is causing right now, due to its not being prepared to take account of current history. The effect of this is to deny many hundreds of businesses the benefit of an excellent record and to create many serious anomalies in establishing the new scheme and the new scale of premiums.

I shall outline some of the inequities that have been brought to the attention of the Opposition. A self-employed man, who has just turned 60, had private workers compensation cover, which took into account a heart condition. However, in being forced to transfer to WorkCover he has been told that he will not be covered in the event that his heart condition recurs while he is working, and he cannot keep his private insurance. The WorkCover office has admitted to the man that this position was overlooked when the legislation was drawn up. Child-care centres are being levied at a rate of 3.8 per cent of payroll, while kindergartens are rated at 1.8 per cent, even though there is little, if any, difference in the nature of the work. This means massive increases in premiums for child-care centres and, inevitably, will increase the cost of child care. Some specific examples have been brought to our attention: in one case the premium has increased from \$800 to \$3 000; in another it has increased from \$1 800 to \$6 800, while in another it has increased from \$600 to \$2 400.

Further, physiotherapists and chiropractors are being levied at 4.5 per cent, while general practitioners are being levied at .7 per cent. On directing inquiries to the WorkCover office, some physiotherapists have been told that their levy equates with that applicable in Victoria—that is not true, as the Victorian levy is 1.52 per cent, only about one-third of the WorkCover levy. It is believed that only one chiropractor in South Australia has had a significant workers compensation claim in recent years, but the general experience of this profession with WorkCover is that premiums will rise by as much as 600 per cent. The effect of this decision is to classify a chiropractor's receptionist as being engaged in heavy industry.

In sport, the South Australian Bowling Association faces a 300 per cent rise in its workers compensation premium. Its levy will be the same as for a copper or aluminium smelter. In the printing industry, one company, which has made only one claim in 40 years, faces an annual premium of more than \$14 000—almost double that of last year. The

insurance industry has been rated at the same premium level as police work, and it is 260 per cent above banks and financial institutions, 155 per cent above real estate offices, and 80 per cent above legal and accounting services, all of which involved similar occupations and working environments. In the case of one relatively small company, this will mean that its annual premium will rise from \$9 500 to \$24 000. Many public statements that have been made by a range of organisations affected by WorkCover—even the Trades and Labor Council—have raised major anomalies and inequities which could be resolved by the Government's approaching the board to take into account the safety records of companies which are forced to register with WorkCover.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I do not have a great deal to add to what I have already said, except to restate the Government's position: we made it quite clear from the outset that the principle was that, by and large, the service industries would subsidise the manufacturing and productive side of our economy. We make no apologies for that. If that has only just dawned on members opposite, one could well ask, 'Where were they when the legislation was going through Parliament?' They must be very slow learners. Reference has been made to differences of 300 per cent. I can give honourable members as many examples as they wish of differences of 300 per cent the other way—I have given an example of such differences in relation to shearing, where the figure reduced from over 13 per cent to 4.5 per cent.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: The honourable member for Alexandra is smiling on the back bench, as well he may.

The Hon. Ted Chapman: At your lack of appreciation of the subject.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: He ought to be smiling, as he knows all about the problems that shearing contractors have had in relation to workers compensation. The same applies to metal manufacturing, where there have been reductions in premiums of many hundreds of per cent—from over 20 per cent for some classifications down to 4.5 per cent. We make no apologies for this. The retail and child care areas are mainly service industries. That was the whole intention of the scheme and, if this has only just dawned on members opposite, that says nothing for their comprehension—nothing at all. That is the idea.

With regard to there being specific anomalies in relation to chiropractors' receptionists and doctors' receptionists, I will certainly send a copy of today's *Hansard* to the Chairman of the board of the corporation so that the board can deal with that matter, although it is aware of this occurrence and has stated that, if there are anomalies that cannot be explained, or if mistakes have been made, it will correct them. What it is not prepared to do, and what it cannot do, is to say that there will be huge decreases for the productive sector without there being increases for the service sector, because that is the way in which the scheme was constructed. That was always the intention, it has been the intention for nine years, and it will remain the intention.

Those few members opposite who have a rural background ought to talk to the United Farmers and Stock-owners Association because, to its credit, it has supported this scheme for many years. I am sure that a number of members here are members of the UF&S and I commend them for their foresight. The WorkCover board is aware of all these queries and is having them examined. However, what it cannot do, will not do, and will not be permitted to do is interfere with the basic rationale of the scheme, which is to assist the productive sectors of our economy.

ENTERPRISE CENTRE

Mr TYLER: Will the Minister of State Development and Technology investigate the feasibility of establishing an enterprise centre (otherwise known as a small business incubator or shared work space) in the southern suburbs? I have been advised by the Noarlunga city council that it recently received a report from its economic development planning group about the benefits of enterprise centres. The report advises that such centres have existed overseas for many years, and that many of them have been most successful in assisting new businesses to become established.

The council has advised me that, as part of its efforts to help create new job opportunities in the south, it wishes to look more closely at the prospect of establishing an enterprise zone. The council tells me that it is currently undertaking feasibility studies to determine the practicality of establishing such a zone and that these may take some time to complete. I am aware that the council has drawn its investigations to the Minister's attention and has asked for Government support for such a centre, perhaps by way of a pilot scheme.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: I thank the honourable member for his question, which is a very pertinent one given the work presently taking place within my combined ministries. In recent days I have asked Dr Peter Ellyard, who is presently serving as Executive Officer within my portfolio, to convene meetings with the Small Business Corporation, the Office of Employment and Training (in particular the self-employment ventures part of that office) and with people from Rotary who have approached the Government to examine what can best be done to assist in the development of small business incubators in South Australia. In that context, the approach from Noarlunga council has been referred to the committee for its further consideration.

I can say that the work Noarlunga has done on this is to be commended. They have indicated that there is something local government can do in enhancing local development opportunities in its area, and it is matched by the work that the Southern Region of Councils has been doing recently with its economic development work, including the provision of a data base on industry in its area, and the monthly report on industrial land availability, which is for prospective investors. That is the kind of thing we should be seeing more of, that is, local government recognising that it too has an economic development thrust to which it should be responding.

The issue of small business incubators has received support overseas and, to an extent, we have something similar here in the multitenant facilities at Technology Park which are a kind of small business incubator. Evidence from other parts of Australia and the world suggests that a complete turnaround in the mortality rate, if I can use that word, of small business can be achieved if small business incubators are available. We know that 60 per cent to 70 per cent of small businesses go out of business within two years of establishment, either by withdrawing voluntarily or being involuntarily forced out through bankruptcy. The record shows that those small businesses that start off in small business incubators have almost an exact reversal of that situation: after two years 70 per cent to 80 per cent of them are still in business. So, I am happy to advise that I have referred this matter to that committee. I will certainly keep the honourable member posted, and I thank him for his interest in the matter. He has, on a number of occasions, promoted the development needs of the southern area.

WORKCOVER

Mr OSWALD: Given his comments in reply to the member for Newland this afternoon, can the Minister of Labour say whether the Government will review the position of ordinary South Australians who employ part-time gardeners, cleaners, babysitters and other forms of home help but who are unable to have their workers compensation liability covered by the new WorkCover scheme? Before the introduction of WorkCover, the liability of householders employing such forms of help was usually covered by general home insurance policies in the event of an accident on their property to these domestic employees.

However, the new scheme will not cover cases where the annual wages bill is less than \$5 000 or the employment lasts for fewer than five days. I am advised that the legal position is that an employer-employee relationship still exists regardless of remuneration and time worked, meaning that that householder will still have a liability in the event of a person in domestic employment being injured while working.

Evidence coming to the Opposition suggests that thousands of South Australians who are potentially exposed to large workers compensation payouts will be unable to insure against this liability. Over the past fortnight the Government has taken out full-page newspaper advertisements in an effort to simplify this problem of its own making. Rather than help householders caught by the anomaly, the advertisements have created utter confusion, because the Government has at the same time refused to review the scheme—

The SPEAKER: Order! If the member for Morphet continues in that vein, I will have to withdraw leave for his question. It is the first question of the day which has, unfortunately, strayed into the area of comment.

Mr OSWALD: I will just finish the sentence and I will sit down, Sir. The advertisements have created utter confusion, because the Government has—

The SPEAKER: Order! If the honourable member is merely repeating the sentence I pulled him up on before, I will definitely have to withdraw leave for him to conclude his question. The honourable Minister of Labour.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I thank the member for Morphet for giving me the opportunity to speak again on this topic. Let us just go back to the previous position, before I deal again with the present position. I thought I had covered it very well in my response to the question of the member for Newland. However, members of the Opposition seem to be having a little difficulty in understanding today, so I will go over it in even greater detail.

The position under the old Act was that no domestic employees were covered. Never, in the 12 years in which I have been in this Parliament, did I see any attempt made by the Opposition, either in Government or in Opposition, to rectify that position. I never saw any attempt. Their crocodile tears now of worrying about domestic employees are, to say the least, a little belated. However, belated or not, I welcome this change of heart of caring for employees for the first time. The position is clear: if one employs a person in a domestic situation and pays that person more than \$5 000 a year, one must register and pay a levy. If one pays less than \$5 000 a year and employs a person for more than five days a year, one does not have to pay a levy. It costs you nothing: you get coverage for nothing.

My information is that 95 per cent of domestic employees are now covered—the overwhelming majority are covered at no cost. I would have said that that was a major advance on the previous position, and something about which any fairminded person would congratulate the Government and

the Minister. A person who comes in to prune a person's roses once a year is the type of employee about whom we are talking. If that person is a self-employed person with a gardening business, he has to make his own arrangements, unless the Opposition would like us to cover self-employed people. If it does, we will certainly consider it. A householder might feel sorry for a person who comes in off the street and looks as if he can prune roses. If that person carries out the pruning what is the position if the householder is not covered for workers compensation?

If one goes to SGIC (or a number of other insurance companies—not all, but certainly SGIC) to cover the occasional person who is not self-employed and who comes onto one's premises to work under a household policy, SGIC will quote a very low premium.

An honourable member: It is \$21.60.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I am advised the premium is \$21.60—it is less than that. If any members are nervous about having someone working for them one day a year—or less than five days a year—who might not be protected, they should approach SGIC, and for \$20 it will take care of all those worries. The same applies to anyone in the community. However, members opposite appear unable to grasp the principle. Therefore, because of the Opposition's inability to understand and because of the lousiness of its members not wanting to pay \$20, I undertake to ask the board whether it will cover those few people who are not self-employed and who might want to prune the member for Kavel's roses on one day of the year. To the member for Morphet, I say, 'Yes, I will consider it.' I do not believe it is worth the argument.

POLICE SUSPENSION

Mr ROBERTSON: Can the Minister of Emergency Services say whether a police officer has been suspended from duty in relation to alleged offences involving the racing industry? Page 4 of this morning's *Advertiser* reports that a senior officer is facing charges relating to breaches of police regulations. According to the article, the charges were connected with 'alleged links between the harness racing industry and police corruption'.

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: I would like to thank the honourable member for that question because the article, which I also have in front of me, indicates considerable confusion on the part of the *Advertiser's* police reporter. I understand that the Police Commissioner released a disclaimer over the media about an hour ago, but I think it is important that I set the record straight in this Chamber. I do not think that there is any doubt, if one reads the article simply at face value, that one would draw two conclusions: first, that somehow this is new information, involving a police officer other than any other police officer who may have come under the notice of the courts recently; and, secondly, that it is something arising out of an investigation into corruption allegations either directly in the harness racing industry or through a link between that industry and police corruption. Both conclusions are false.

The police officer referred to on page 4 of this morning's *Advertiser* is the same police officer who was previously, and is currently, before the courts and whose name has been suppressed. No other police officer is facing charges in relation to those matters which, as honourable members know, relate to allegations of drug dealings. The second matter relates to the harness racing industry, and the last paragraph of the *Advertiser* article states:

The charges stem from a joint investigation by the National Crime Authority and the police Internal Investigation Branch into

alleged links between the harness racing industry and police corruption.

That is plainly incorrect. This is the second time in about a fortnight that newspapers in this State have editorialised about some sort of link between the present inquiry and harness racing when in fact there is no such link.

I had the benefit of a briefing from a high ranking officer of the NCA last week, and I went over with him fairly thoroughly the information so far to hand. It is true that in an investigation like this one never knows exactly what might turn up, and I suppose that is similar to the early exploration of Australia when the decision on how far one went depended on two things: first, your determination and, secondly, how far the continent extended and what was there to be discovered. At this stage I can say only that the invitation for the NCA to become involved in this matter did not arise from concern about any aspect of the harness racing industry, and nor to this date have any serious allegations come before the NCA about any such link. I have no doubt that the media knows about as much as I do about these things (which is usually the case), but I cannot understand, in the light of what I have said, why there was this editorial comment at the bottom of the article on page 4 of this morning's *Advertiser* which reads as if it is established fact.

The only reason it is there is that the newspapers have previously run that same story and they have made some leap of faith (if I can put it that way) because a member of this House made entirely unsubstantiated allegations in this place about the harness racing industry. I make it perfectly clear that if there is anything there it will be uncovered, but, first, nothing has been uncovered and, secondly, that was not the reason for setting up the inquiry in the first place. All members of the media know that the invitation to the NCA to become involved here resulted from our concern about drugs.

WORKCOVER

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: Why is it that the Minister of Labour will not review anomalies in premium levels and cover for domestic employment when the Government is already considering other significant changes to workers compensation legislation? Answers by the Minister this afternoon to members from his own bench, and from this side, clearly indicate that he has a closed mind on the problems of businesses faced with significantly increased premiums and the dilemma of people employing home help who cannot cover these workers compensation liabilities. The Minister refuses to review these particular circumstances, yet already, with this scheme less than a week old, some other significant changes to the Act are being considered by the Government.

I have in my possession a draft Bill drawn up at the Government's instructions. It reveals that 20 pages of amendments have been drawn up, suggesting an admission by the Government that WorkCover was seriously deficient even before its introduction. In these circumstances the Minister should explain why he is not prepared to consider other serious flaws which are causing grave concern to thousands of South Australians, both businesses and householders.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: Mr Speaker, we appear to be having a dialogue of the deaf here. I have just responded to the member for Morphett. I know honourable members opposite have their questions prepared for them but when the answer to the question has already been given I would

have thought the honourable member would have the wit to drop that part of the question.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I stated quite clearly to the member for Morphett that if this handful of people who may come on your property once a year—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: —are so incapable of looking after themselves, then I would see if it is necessary for me to take them by the hand and deal with their problem. I finished the answer to the member for Morphett—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: Yes, this is the third time. It will eventually sink in, one would hope. I said to the member for Morphett that I would take that up with the board, as it does not seem to me to be worth the argument. I would have thought that that was fairly clear.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: As regards amendments to the Act, I have previously stated in this House that my guess is that we will amend the Workers Compensation Act virtually every session, just as we amend the Local Government Act, the IC&A Act, and the Planning Act: you name it, we amend it. It is a significant part of our work. We may well have to amend things more to get a 4 per cent productivity increase, but I can guarantee that the issue of workers compensation will be subject to constant revision and constant amendment.

I point out to the member for Light what I have said for the third time: what we will not do is change the fundamental structure of the scheme which benefits and assists the productive sectors of our economy, possibly to the initial detriment of the service sector. That is the whole intention of the scheme and it is one that we are going to maintain. I would have thought that it would be something we would not have had to argue with members of the Liberal Party, who claim to support the productive sectors of our community. I thought we would not have to argue it, but I suggest they talk to the UF&S, the Engineering Employers Association (as it is now called) and the Chamber of Commerce. They should talk to the people who produce the wealth that the service sector distributes to this community.

Mr Olsen: Small business is the largest employer in the State.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I thank the Leader of the Opposition for his interjection. I was about to sit down. What about small business? I will go through that again. The overwhelming majority of big business is not involved in the scheme. They are self-insurers, and they are not involved. I mentioned the farming community—over 20 000 small businesses. What about the small manufacturing shops? They are small business. What about small plumbers? What about that sector of the community? They have all gone down—dramatic reductions from 20 per cent to 4.5 per cent. That is what has happened to small business. The productive sector, whether large or small, has gained and will continue to gain from this scheme. We make no apology for saying to the service sector, 'You will initially pay more, but until the productive sector of our economy is thriving there will be nothing further to distribute.' We are looking after the productive sector first. That is the intention of the scheme, and we make no apology for that.

PESTICIDES

Mr RANN: Can the Minister of Agriculture say what progress has been made in tightening up the control of residual pesticides in this State? During recent months considerable controversy has been generated by the identification of potentially harmful organochlorines in Australian meat. It has been reported that South Australia is fortunate in having nowhere near as great a problem with contamination as have other States. In August, the Minister announced a recall program for DDT and other organochlorines, as well as the preparation of legislation aimed at prohibiting the possession or use of organochlorines on South Australian farms after the end of this month. The Minister also indicated in a radio interview that he wished to establish an advisory committee to review the use of chemicals in agriculture. It has been put to me that the debate on organochlorines in meat has focused almost entirely on its trade implication and not on the health impact of such contamination on local foodstuffs consumed by Australians.

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: I thank the honourable member for his question. This matter requires further consideration by the community because there have been, in my opinion, errors of judgment on the part of certain sections of the community concerning the use of these persistent organochlorines and other persistent chemicals that have been used. I hope to give notice tomorrow of an amendment to the Agricultural Chemicals Act 1955 to prohibit the application of persistent organochlorines such as heptachlor, dieldrin, Aldrin, and DDT. The legislation will also increase the penalties substantially in line with what other States are doing to meet the same level of penalty for people using those chemicals for agricultural purposes.

The recall program undertaken by the department has been successful. We established, I think, 70 depots in country regions especially using local government facilities and more than 200 people have responded to that recall program. We have collected about 10 tonnes of DDT and five tonnes of other persistent organochlorines, which will be stored in a secure and safe place until the Agricultural Council decides, with the Federal Government, how best we can divest ourselves safely of these persistent chemicals. That is quite an exercise in itself.

I assure members that the collection has gone successfully. The damaged containers that have been returned have been decanted by departmental staff and placed in secure containers for safe transport to a central depot. We will ensure that the central depot is secure and protected so that it does not present a danger to the community at large, a danger that it can present when the chemicals are stored in such large quantities. As to the Advisory Committee on the Use of Agricultural Chemicals, I expect that the terms of reference of the committee will be adopted by Cabinet and Caucus in the next week or so and I look forward to being able to use that committee effectively to broaden the perspective on the use of agricultural chemicals, especially in considering what alternatives are available in a productive sense.

I hope to have representatives of the chemicals industry, the agricultural industry and consumers, and people with a broader interest in gardening and organic farming aspects, as well as some media representatives who have an interest in this area of industry. I look forward to their skills being applied productively for the benefit of the South Australian community, especially the agricultural community that has suffered stress because of the impact that these chemical residues and meat issues have brought on the rural community.

The other aspect concerns the introduction of Queensland tomatoes into South Australia. We have substantial evidence from the industry as well as from our own inspectors that retailers have foolishly brought in Queensland tomatoes that have not been dipped to protect them from fruit fly contamination. I believe that we have successfully curtailed the activities of those people and it seems that we have contained the problem. The Leader of the Opposition may be interested to know that the threat to the industry from such imported tomatoes would be significant, as we are talking about an industry of about \$240 million or \$250 million to this State. It is worth again warning those people in the community who may be foolish and careless enough to entertain the idea of introducing such tomatoes to our domestic market.

The other aspect concerns the monitoring of meat for domestic consumption, which is important. We will develop the same degree of regime testing programs. We have to finalise some of the details to provide protection not only for our export market but also for our domestic market and our home consumers. That is an important aspect which in some cases has been overlooked during the debate. I issue a warning. At a meeting at Keith a fortnight ago I had the opportunity to meet a couple of farmers who are involved in the meat industry. They are concerned about some people who are active in the rural industry, especially large companies which they told me, accurately, have large stores of DDT material and have told these farmers that they intend to use it.

These farmers are concerned about the threat to their industry and I again warn those people that the legislation is about to be presented to Parliament. I expect it to go through, perhaps with some amendment, but it will impose high penalties. I warn those people that, if they intend to use those chemicals, they will be in breach of the law very shortly. The penalties will be great and we will ensure that they are enforced both by departmental staff and by other officers of the Government. I issue that warning to those people. I know that others in the community have large quantities of DDT, dieldrin, and heptachlor stored and I warn them about the use of those chemicals in the agricultural environment.

BELAIR-BRIDGEWATER RAILWAY

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: Can the Minister of Transport say whether, before receiving the final report of the Bureau of Transport Economics on the Bridgewater railway line, the South Australian Government was ever in receipt of the bureau's draft report?

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: Yes.

BELAIR RECREATION PARK

Mr FERGUSON: Will the Minister for Environment and Planning investigate the possibility of allowing, in advance, the bulk purchase of entry tickets to Belair Recreation Park? I have been approached by a party hire firm in my electorate to see whether it would be possible to purchase either entry tickets or car stickers in advance for entry to Belair Recreation Park. At this time of the year many parties and end of year functions are held in the reserve. Some embarrassment is caused to the hosts and hostesses of these parties who must find a way of refunding the entrance fee to guests. It has been suggested that it would be more appropriate if entry tickets could be sent out with the original invitations.

It has also been suggested that an annual season ticket would be of advantage.

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: I am happy to take up the positive suggestion from the honourable member. As I understand it, the system is working well and has been well received by the public. Indeed, in some cases within the National Parks and Wildlife Service the whole concept of the charges and the setting up of the trust fund has provided perhaps a new avenue for the exercising of entrepreneurial enthusiasm.

BELAIR-BRIDGEWATER RAILWAY

Mr INGERSON: Will the Minister of Transport explain why there is a major discrepancy between his answer this afternoon about the Bureau of Transport Economics report on the Bridgewater railway and an answer given in the House of Representatives on the same matter this afternoon by the Minister for Land Transport (Mr Duncan)?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr INGERSON: This afternoon, Mr Duncan said in the House of Representatives:

He—

meaning the South Australian Minister of Transport—

contacted me and said he was concerned to find that the final report and the draft had differed somewhat.

However, in his answer this afternoon, the Minister of Transport completely contradicted this, saying:

In terms of the report itself, I never had any discussion with the Minister for Land Transport about the report.

He also said:

Subsequently to the report being received, I have had no discussion with the Minister.

So, Mr Duncan has said that the South Australian Minister did raise with him concerns about the discrepancies between the two reports, while the Minister of Transport here in this Parliament flatly denies this.

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: I think the member for Bragg is slightly incorrect with his information. In replying to the Leader's question, in relation to the report I said that I did not discuss it with the Minister for Land Transport, although on one occasion I did ask him whether he was involved in its preparation. He told me that it was purely and simply a matter for the Bureau of Transport Economics. That is not in conflict with the answer that the honourable member has now said that my colleague the Minister for Land Transport gave in the House of Representatives.

I will clarify for the honourable member and for the House the difference between my statement about subsequent to receiving a report and speaking to the Minister. I was given a copy of the report before it was formally released, and I am prepared to correct my statement inasmuch as to say that from the time it was formally released I had no discussion with the Minister for Land Transport about it. There is no conflict between his reply and my reply—and there is no need for there to be, because there was only the one discussion. The very clever tactics of the Liberal Party in asking a question in Canberra and in asking a question here were able to elicit the clear fact that we had only the one discussion. The Minister for Land Transport said that there was only one discussion and I said that there was only one discussion. I said that I had asked the Minister for Land Transport whether he had any involvement in the preparation of the report, and he told me that he had not,

because it was a matter for the Bureau of Transport Economics. As I understand the honourable member, the Minister for Land Transport gave the same reply in Canberra.

Mr Olsen interjecting:

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: I have it here.

Mr Olsen interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Chair will not tolerate dialogue across the floor between members.

STATE HERITAGE BRANCH

Mr DUIGAN: Has the Minister for Environment and Planning noted the recent criticisms made of the State Heritage Branch, and will he say whether he is satisfied with the methods and procedures followed by Heritage Branch staff when assessing development projects which may have an impact on built heritage? An article in this morning's *Advertiser* referred to various Adelaide city councillors as having accused Heritage Branch staff of bureaucratic bungling. The article states:

The Heritage Branch was criticised by several council members for delaying advice on the proposal [the East End Market development] until the last minute.

Further, the report in this morning's *Advertiser* quotes one councillor as referring to what was described as the late arrival of Heritage Branch submissions. Also, one developer was quoted as saying that the operations of the branch left a lot to be desired.

TECHNICAL AND FURTHER EDUCATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

EDUCATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

QUESTION TIME RESUMED

The SPEAKER: I now call the Deputy Premier.

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: I was not sure whether or not I had lost my right to answer the question. Briefly, the position is that I saw the article. I regard the comments of those councillors as being quite unfair, and I think it is important that I set the record straight. I have a role to play in these matters where heritage items are involved. The point at which I play that role is when the City of Adelaide Planning Commission invites me, as the Minister responsible for State heritage, to indeed give a point of view in regard to a heritage item, and it is at that point that I seek an opinion from the Heritage Branch, which is invariably incorporated in my advice to the City of Adelaide Planning Commission. That is the only formal part of the process where the Heritage Branch needs to be involved. However, the informal process has grown up of the Heritage Branch—

Mr S.G. EVANS: On a point of order, Mr Speaker, I might be wrong, but I thought that Standing Orders provided that after 3.15 p.m., even if we have gone over the hour because of the recognition of a past member's unfortunate death, the answer to a question could not be given, and that at that time Question Time was finished.

The SPEAKER: The Standing Order to which the member refers was altered in February last year, so that the last question can still be concluded. The fact that I did not call on the Deputy Premier at the right time was because the attention of the Chair was distracted by another matter at that moment. Does the Minister wish to complete his reply?

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: I do, Sir, yes. It is not unreasonable that I should address myself to this. Certain public servants have, I believe, been unfairly criticised in the media, and I want to take some little time in resolving this matter—not an untoward amount of time. I would have thought that that change of Standing Orders was one to protect the integrity of Question Time and to ensure that circumstances such as might have arisen had you upheld that point of order, Mr Speaker, never occur. There is no legal requirement or obligation for the State Heritage Branch to assist council in the way in which I was indicating. An informal process has developed whereby the branch indicates to the City of Adelaide the sort of advice that it will give me, once it reaches that further stage. That seems perfectly reasonable to me, and yet what is being complained of is the way in which that informal process was carried out.

The informal process makes for the smoother functioning of the planning process, and I think it should continue. So, for these aldermen and councillors to criticise the State Heritage Branch for attempting to assist them in fulfilling their own responsibilities is, I believe, churlish and unfair, especially in view of the fact that the processing of the timetable for these applications was and is established by the council itself. I regret the misconceptions that have been spread in the council and the media about the role of the State Heritage Branch in the East End Market development proposal. I want to reaffirm my confidence in the professionalism, objectivity and reliability of the branch and its officers.

SITTINGS AND BUSINESS

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD (Deputy Premier): I move:
That the time allowed for all stages of the following Bills—
Appropriation Bill,
Business Franchise (Petroleum Products) Act Amendment Bill, and
Land Tax Act Amendment Bill—
be until 6 p.m. on Thursday.
Motion carried.

PUBLIC WORKS STANDING COMMITTEE

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD (Deputy Premier): I move:
That, pursuant to section 18 of the Public Works Standing Committee Act 1927, the members of this House appointed to that committee have leave to sit on that committee during the sittings of the House tomorrow.
Motion carried.

PUBLIC ACCOUNTS COMMITTEE

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD (Deputy Premier): I move:
That, pursuant to section 15 of the Public Accounts Committee Act 1972, the members of this House appointed to the committee have leave to sit on that committee during the sitting of the House today.
Motion carried.

APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr FERGUSON (Henley Beach): I bring up the report of Estimates Committee A, and move:
That the report be received.

Motion carried.

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

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

Motion carried.

Ms GAYLER (Newland): I bring up the report of Estimates Committee B, and move:

That the report be received.

Motion carried.

Ms GAYLER: I bring up the minutes of proceedings of Estimates Committee B, and move:

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

Motion carried.

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

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

Mr OLSEN (Leader of the Opposition): Since the introduction of the South Australian budget the 1987-88 appropriations of the Federal Government and the New South Wales Government (our most populous State) have been put before their respective Parliaments. They provide some important points of comparison. Mr Keating says that his budget is a key element in an overall strategy to tackle the nation's balance of payments problem and record interest rates by winding back the public sector borrowing requirement and reducing inflation.

In pursuing this strategy the Federal Treasurer has complained about the reluctance of the States to play their part. For example, last financial year he intervened to stop the South Australian Government issuing deferred annuities as a means of circumventing Loan Council guidelines on borrowings. At page 58 of Federal Budget Paper No. 1, Mr Keating observed the following increases in some State taxes and charges will help to hold up inflation in the first half of this financial year. The May Economic Statement was based on a Commonwealth forecast of an inflation rate of 6.8 per cent in the 1987-88 year. However, this has had to be revised upwards in the Federal budget to 7 per cent, reflecting rises in taxes and charges in some State budgets brought down recently.

The South Australian Government's contribution to inflationary pressures includes a higher rate of petrol tax and rises significantly above inflation for other key items, including public transport fares, Housing Trust rentals and motor registration fees. The Premier said in a statement reported in the *News* on 10 June 1986 that the Government would consider, over the following 12 months, introducing a system of automatic increases in State charges and fees in line with consumer price index movements. My questioning of the Premier during the Estimates Committees indicated that this was yet another commitment made on the run—a promise made for the moment to avoid an adverse headline—without any intention of its being implemented. I suggest that public reaction to some of the recent rises in Government charges shows that the Premier has

placed too much faith in the ability of taxpayers to forget his promises.

Mr Keating, as well, has reason to criticise States like South Australia which are not making their contribution to the nation's longer term economic objectives. At a time when Government restraint is paramount this Government is increasing tax collections by 11.3 per cent this financial year, more than 4 per cent in real terms. By comparison, the New South Wales budget, brought down a fortnight ago, plans to increase tax revenues by 8.5 per cent while Victoria estimates its tax collections will be kept in line with inflation at 7 per cent.

Importantly for South Australian industry, the State budgets of our two main competitors, in terms of domestic markets, both contain significant payroll tax concessions. In New South Wales these concessions will be worth \$100 million in a full year, and in Victoria \$52.5 million. This means that the threshold below which payroll tax will not be levied in New South Wales will be \$400 000, and in Victoria \$300 000. They have also increased the level at which exemptions to the tax taper out. In New South Wales that level is to be \$1.4 million, and in Victoria \$1.7 million.

In the case of both the threshold and the taper out level these budget decisions put South Australian industry at a disadvantage as our threshold is being kept at \$270 000, despite the election promise of the Premier to keep it under annual review. Therefore, the level at which exemptions taper out in South Australia will be \$350 000 lower than in Victoria, and \$50 000 lower than in New South Wales. Indeed, if we look at payroll tax levels in all the States, only Western Australia now has a lower threshold than South Australia.

In the West the amount is currently \$250 000, but for small business this is offset by a lower rate of payroll tax—3.75 per cent, compared with 5 per cent in South Australia. In other words, payroll tax now costs the small South Australian firm more than in virtually every other part of Australia. Had the Premier been prepared this financial year to raise our threshold to the level of Victoria's, this would have exempted about 170 small businesses from payroll tax. Had the New South Wales initiative been followed, with an exemption level of \$400 000, a further 440 South Australian small businesses would have benefited.

The Premier cannot afford to have payroll tax obligations in this State greater than those elsewhere while our unemployment is well above the national average. The Premier may respond by claiming that this analysis does not take into account the 1 per cent surcharge on payrolls in New South Wales and Victoria. However, I remind the Premier that when, in the lead-up to the 1982 South Australian election, he sought to make payroll tax differentials a significant issue that surcharge still applied in our neighbouring States, but this did not stop him claiming then that much more should be done in South Australia. It did not stop him moving a censure motion against the former Liberal Government on 2 December 1981 on this very matter of differences between the States.

Now that South Australian industry's comparative position is much worse, particularly when measured against New South Wales, all the Premier can do is compound his hypocrisy by breaking an election promise to increase the threshold this financial year to take into account inflation. The reason for this Government's reluctance to lighten the burden of South Australian industry in this way, and to provide more incentive to create new jobs, is its greed for more tax revenues to fund higher levels of spending.

The Estimates Committees have provided no evidence of any conscious, conscientious or consistent policy by Min-

isters to limit departmental spending. The fact that the Government has to bribe the Public Service with a 4 per cent wage rise to achieve productivity improvements demonstrates its weakness and its failure to insist upon more effective and efficient management.

The Government says savings worth at least \$35 million must be found to offset this rise. If those savings can be found now, by dangling the bait of a wage rise, what was to stop the Government finding them last year or the year before? If the Government had been determined to achieve savings, and if it had made a concerted attack on government waste, there would have been no need in this budget to increase the rate of petrol tax so that it will cost motorists an extra \$30 million in a full year.

The Estimates Committees have identified other areas where a failure of Government will and determination will transfer even more of the cost of lax and lazy administration onto taxpayers. In the Premier's own area of administration there is the issue of reducing Commonwealth-State duplication. In the *Advertiser* on 18 November 1986 the Premier was quoted as saying that the Federal and State Governments could save scores of millions of dollars each year by cutting administrative doubling up, and he said that South Australia was identifying areas of overlap and opportunities to rationalise or change existing programs.

To give the impression of unrelenting momentum, the Premier said in May this year that he would make a further bid to achieve action by having the matter put on the Premiers Conference agenda. The coordinating body for achieving action has been the Australian Council for Inter-Governmental Relations. Over the past four years, South Australian taxpayers have contributed almost \$124 000 to the cost of this body, yet what have we achieved for this outlay—what has been the result of the Premier's high profile, high rhetoric on this important matter? Absolutely nothing—except the scrapping of the Council for Inter-Governmental Relations. When I questioned the Premier about this during the Estimates Committee, he had to admit that nothing of any significance had been achieved in reducing duplication between the Commonwealth and the States. He could not even identify a single area where there had been savings to the taxpayer.

Further examples of this Government's emphasis on public relations rather than genuine effort to cut waste were established during the Estimates Committee inquiry into the Education Department. For example, the Opposition has established that:

The much publicised 'back to schools policy' has been a sham—while the Government promised it would cut 67 senior bureaucrats out of the department and send many of them back to schools, there have been only four such transfers.

Government dithering over a school transport policy is costing \$3 million a year. This matter has been before committees and consultants for the past four years because the Government refuses to face the challenge of allowing more private contractors to provide those services.

For similar reasons, the Government has refused to take positive action to reduce the \$20 million a year school cleaning bill by using more industrial contractors; rather, the Minister of Education has bowed to union pressure and put a moratorium call on all cleaning tender calls.

The failures of management typified by these examples lead inevitably to an education bureaucracy which is so top heavy that the Government cannot even keep accurate pay records. Last financial year it overpaid departmental employees by \$800 000.

The Estimates Committee also exposed the intention of the Minister of Education to close the Raywood Inservice Centre at Bridgewater. Last year, when the Opposition raised this possibility, the Minister said he was staggered to hear of it and that the Opposition was being destructive and it was ill-informed. Now, the Minister's statements in his Estimates Committee suggest the question is no longer if, but when, the centre will close.

It is an indictment of this Government's priorities that it has to look at closing a centre as important and valuable as this one because it exercises such appalling financial management in other areas of education. My colleagues will also take up during this debate other examples of waste and mismanagement identified during the Estimates Committees, such as:

The 66 per cent rise in call-back fees and overtime payments to Correctional Services staff because the Government has ignored recommendations made by the Parliamentary Public Accounts Committee.

The ballooning amounts of money being paid out for workers compensation for public servants which show that the Government, as the State's largest employer, is guilty of slack management practices—while the Minister of Labour has been keen to condemn practices in the private sector, this Government's record as an employer is abysmal, with compensation payouts increasing four-fold in just five years.

The waste of almost \$1.2 million on designing the entertainment centre—the Minister of Tourism revealed to her Estimates Committee that this cost had been incurred by the Government in paying consultants for 'developing the design of the centre', yet, in his statement of 25 August announcing the shelving of the centre, the Premier said, 'The Government cannot afford to proceed with the centre as previously designed and specified'—in other words, the self-indulgent, cynical election promise made by the Premier to build the centre is going to cost more than \$1 million in wasted design fees alone.

The conflict between the Premier and the Minister of Forests on the accounting of the Woods and Forests Department—the Premier says that the Government intends to require the department to furnish accounts in line with standards recognised by the Auditor-General, but the Minister of Forests told his Estimates Committee that this would not happen and implied that the qualified report by the Auditor-General on the department's accounts for 1986-87 virtually would be ignored; and

The \$1.5 million overrun in the cost of building the new Kangaroo Island ferry *Island Seaway* because of, to use the Minister of Marine's words, 'consulting expenditure and project management expenditure'.

No doubt the Government will blindly reject these examples, as it has in the past, but there are further examples of waste thrown up during the Estimates Committees which it cannot deny—because it was highlighted by one of the Government's own members. I refer to discussion before the Minister of Housing and Construction's Estimates Committee about the cost of \$3.6 million the Housing Trust incurred last financial year in paying the excess water bills of tenants.

The member for Gilles, the former Minister of Water Resources, had this to say about this item of expenditure:

Under this method of water rating there must be a tremendous opportunity for wastage. Indeed, someone may be having three or four showers a day, and that is an obvious waste of water.

I do not know about the three or four showers a day, but it clearly identifies the capacity for wastage, where there is no accountability because the taxpayers are picking up the tab. Typically, the Minister of Housing and Construction

had no worthwhile answer. We did hear from him during the Estimates Committee that he was glad his father had been a truck driver. But, for the most part, he gave rambling irrelevant answers to frustrate the role of the Committee.

In this, he is in the company of the Minister of Health, whose renowned verbosity limited to 84 the number of questions his Estimates Committee was able to ask. The members of the Minister of Housing and Construction's Committee were slightly more fortunate—they managed to get in 128 questions—although his performance would have been on about a par with the Health Minister's had he not been in some apparent rush to get home early and therefore decided to consign to notice a significant number of questions in the closing stages of his Committee. These performances can be contrasted with that of the Attorney-General, who answered 189 questions during his Estimates Committee.

There is little doubt that some Ministers deliberately sought to prevent the Estimates Committees fulfilling their proper function. Some Ministers obviously arranged for Government backbenchers to ask general questions inviting time-consuming replies, to prevent Opposition members seeking information directly relevant to the purposes of program performance budgeting. In the case of the Premier, for example, Government members asked questions which allowed him to give quite long answers of a general nature about the Jubilee 150 celebrations, the progress of trade relations with Japan, inner urban renewal, and even about placing advertising signs on Government vehicles.

This last question was asked by the member for Albert Park, who seemed to have a particular brief to cut the Opposition out of questions during the Estimates Committees. There can be no other explanation for the fact that the honourable member asked both the Premier and the Minister of Transport the same question about the Access Cab Scheme. The members for Mawson, Briggs and Fisher were similarly active, asking parish pump questions about particular electorate matters which should have no place in these Estimates Committees.

If the member for Mawson wants to know what plans the Housing Trust has to build homes in her electorate; if the member for Briggs wants to know whether traffic lights are to be installed at the intersection of Golden Grove Road and Milne Road; if the member for Fisher wants to know whether the State Transport Authority will closely monitor the public transport needs of the Sheidow Park and Trott Park areas, they can put questions on notice or write to the responsible Minister.

If the member for Briggs is really interested in asking the Minister of State Development and Technology a whole series of general questions about the submarine contract, relations with Shandong Province, business migration, the progress of the South Australian Development Fund, an assessment of the Small Business Corporation, the availability of venture capital, and a 'cross-fertilisation' of industrial and academic research between Technology Park and the Institute of Technology at The Levels, he can take his turn in Question Time, put questions on notice or write to the Minister (although I understand that Government members are having the same difficulty as we are in getting from Ministers answers to correspondence. The Deputy Premier among his own colleagues is recognised as the worst for responding to correspondence).

That sort of performance demonstrates one of two things—an appalling ignorance of the role of the Estimates Committees and program performance budgeting—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Leader of the Opposition is quite capable of making a contribution without assistance from the Deputy Leader or from the member for Adelaide.

Mr OLSEN: —or a deliberate plan to frustrate the role and duty of Parliament to bring the Government to account. I suggest it is much more the latter than the former, for, while I believe members opposite understand that program performance budgeting and the Estimates Committees were introduced to better inform the Parliament about the Government's financial policies (which happen to include Ayers House and contractual commitments with Ayers House) and to ensure more effective management of the public sector, I am equally certain the Government has little interest in these objectives.

The Opposition recently has spoken to a number of senior public servants and others who have been associated with the introduction of program performance budgeting over the past seven years in the South Australian public sector. Their general conclusion has been that under this Government PPB is dead and buried. It is simply not working. This Government lacks any genuine commitment, and that is proven by an analysis of the resources devoted to PPB.

Treasury was to have the major coordinating role. However, since 1982-83, staff and resources in Treasury devoted to the implementation of PPB have declined. In February 1982 the following initiatives were proposed to departmental heads to facilitate the introduction of PPB: development with the South Australian Institute of Technology of a semester based course in program analysis; development of a PPB information package to provide the base for departmental PPB training courses for accounting and management services personnel; and development of a third executive development course to provide specifically for the training of program analysis.

None of these objectives was followed through even though it was recognised that training was paramount to the effective introduction and utilisation of PPB. The truth of the matter is that Labor has always had a stronger commitment to raising taxes than to spending those taxes wisely. While Treasury resources committed to PPB have declined since the election of this Government, staffing and funding of the State Taxation Office, to help in this Government's tax grab, have been increased enormously.

In April 1975 the Corbett Committee of Inquiry into the South Australian Public Service raised the need to consider PPB for more effective budgeting and Government accountability, but nothing of any substance was achieved until the election four and a half years later of the former Liberal Government, which acted decisively because of its strong view that the Parliament and the public needed to know as much about why public funds were being spent as on what they were being spent.

An effective form of PPB has the following major benefits: it allows priorities in Government spending to be clearly identified; it encourages an assessment of whether there are alternative means of reaching Government policy goals more effectively at less cost; it encourages greater consideration of the longer-term cost of Government programs; and it constantly measures the performance of programs to ensure a dollar's worth of service for each dollar spent. PPB has particular application when Government funds are tight and the bids for them are intense among competing interests such as health, welfare, and education: it allows the Government to completely reassess priorities at frequent intervals; and it makes a very substantial contribution to the process of deciding which services can be maintained or introduced and which services must be reduced or eliminated.

The Hon. Jennifer Cashmore: By measuring outcomes against inputs.

Mr OLSEN: By measuring performance, goal setting, and then judging that performance in terms of the goals that have been set. However, this Government has not applied PPB, so that each budget is regarded as a fresh allocation of resources. Old programs are not being brought under annual review to justify their continuing existence. Past performances are not being analysed to determine whether goals formed in the last budget have been realised or are worth pursuing in the light of other demands on scarce funds. The opportunity for longer-term planning is being wasted.

The international experience of PPB in the United States, Canada, Britain and Europe shows that there have been very few instances where its introduction has not been accompanied by requirements for administrators to project the results of spending programs over a longer period—usually five years. The latest report by the Auditor-General has raised the need for Parliament to be better informed about the longer-term consequences of spending decisions. Mr Sheridan has proposed that the budget documents should incorporate the full year effect for each new major revenue and expenditure initiative, advising that this 'would enable Parliament to be better informed about the longer-term consequences of proposed budget initiatives when passing the Appropriation Bill'. At the same time, his report contains disturbing evidence of the Government's inability to budget for the longer term.

For example, following the introduction of the five-year driver's licence, he has suggested that the Government has not taken sufficient account of the fact that a significant shortfall in these receipts is likely to occur in the fourth and fifth years of the new licence term, with serious implications for the availability of funds for roadworks. This can be found at page 111 of his latest report. The inability of this Government to budget for the longer term is also typified by the cancellation of the entertainment centre and the massive dip in other capital works funding this financial year which disrupts the State economy generally.

This Government has not used PPB to give a consolidated list of the short and long-term goals and strategies of the Government as a whole—when this was a prime purpose of PPB. When criticised about Government accountability, the Premier claims that this Parliament has more information than any other on the workings of Government. However, I challenge him on this point. I do so by pointing out that his Government is not even honouring its statutory responsibility to keep Parliament informed. The House will recall that an important provision of the new Government Management and Employment Act was the requirement that all departments should furnish an annual report to Parliament.

The Opposition strongly supported that provision and sought to improve it at the time the Bill was before Parliament by writing in specific requirements for reporting, particularly in relation to financial matters. The Premier said this matter would be attended to by regulation. To that extent his commitment has been fulfilled, because regulations under the Act issued in June last year spell out matters upon which departments must report to Parliament. They include the agency's operations, initiatives and achievements; management training and staff development programs; health and safety programs; and the financial planning and performance of the agency. A report covering matters like this can be valuable to Parliament in helping members to determine the efficiency and effectiveness of Govern-

ment departments. The Premier sought to make a virtue of this before his Estimates Committee in 1986 when he said:

I hope that next year we can present an even more efficient format. One of the things that will help us is the requirement now, under the new Government Management Act, for departments to produce annual reports.

However, it appears that far too much time has been devoted to making sure these reports are glossy, colourful, and therefore expensive to produce, than to providing them to Parliament in accordance with the Act. Under the Act, all of the 1985-86 annual reports should have been tabled by 20 November 1986: 35 made that deadline but 62 tabled after that date did not, and others have even yet to be tabled. Among those that missed the deadline were the Health Commission, the STA, the Commissioner of Police, the Planning Commission, the Department of Correctional Services, the Department of Environment and Planning, the Public Service Board (with its last report), the Supreme Court judges, and the Department of Further Education.

Reports for 1985-86 which were required by the Act to be prepared for submissions to the responsible Minister within three months of the end of the financial year, and tabled in Parliament within 12 sitting days after that, but which have still to see the light of day, include those for Agriculture, the Arts, Attorney-General's, State Development, Transport, Education, and Housing and Construction Departments. Even the Timber Corporation has been shy in telling this Parliament what it has been up to. That is not surprising, I must say. The reasons for its late report are perhaps easier to understand than the widespread negligence of Ministers in those other areas that I have nominated which are of equal concern to the Parliament. If there is not to be further widespread avoidance of the Act this year, all departments should have their reports to their responsible Ministers by now. The deadline under the Act was 30 September and those reports should be on the table of this House by no later than 10 November.

There is a further important matter of Government inaction that I raise. In February 1983, the Government established a review of Government financial management arrangements. The review committee comprised three senior public servants, an academic, a respected South Australian businessman and the Chief Executive of the Australian Industry Development Corporation. During 1984, the committee made a series of reports on means to improve financial management arrangements within the Government. Those recommendations are now three years old—many have yet to be acted upon.

For example, the review recommended the appointment of a group comprising the Under Treasurer, the Commissioner for Public Employment, the Auditor-General, two other departmental heads and two people from organisations external to the State public sector, to 'provide leadership and to promote practicable improvements in public sector financial management'. It was proposed that one of the objectives of this group would be to foster the development of program performance budgeting. The review recommended establishment of a special body to advise the Government on the finances of statutory authorities. It recommended improvements in the presentation of the budget to Parliament including phasing out the terms 'surplus' and 'deficit' to describe the budget result in favour of an expression which would show the true budget outcome such as 'net financing requirement'.

In its summary report No. 12, the review suggested that while the process of implementation would take several years for full effect 'some worthwhile improvements should be seen within a year or two'. With the exception of the rewrite of the Public Finance and Audit Act, little has been

done to implement some of the valuable recommendations of this review. This further evidence of unwillingness to improve financial management highlights the grave weakening of the chain of accountability which has occurred over the past five years. This can be seen within the Government—and in its accountability to this Parliament.

Program performance budgeting is not working: this Government has no genuine commitment to it; the Public Service has not been adequately trained in how to apply it; and the Government deliberately frustrates the purpose of Parliamentary Estimates Committees. The presentation of budget information is far superior in other States. It is only necessary to look at the New South Wales and Victorian budget papers for this financial year to reach this conclusion. The Government cannot even meet statutory obligations to have departments report to this Parliament at the due time; it is involved in widespread breaches of its own Act so that, by the time many departments do report, the information is out of date.

An increasing number of failures of financial management are being identified by the Auditor-General involving the waste of millions of dollars of taxpayers' money. In addition, as also identified by the Auditor-General, this Government increasingly attempts to by-pass the Parliament by using the spurious disguise of commercial confidentiality to deny information.

This Government has increased spending by 94 per cent. It has increased tax collections by 106 per cent—by more than twice the rate of inflation—yet it has still run up and maintained a record budget deficit, borrowing more and more so that 56c in every tax dollar now collected must meet interest obligations rather than fund new or better services. Circumstances like these, in which government has become so much bigger and costly, impose on the Parliament special duties to ensure full accountability and to expose shortcomings where they do occur. But the conduct of the latest Estimates Committees and the other matters I have raised this afternoon show the determination of this Government to ignore and avoid these vital responsibilities.

We have reached the stage where I suggest a searching inquiry is necessary into government management and accountability. It should act similarly to a Royal Commission, with powers to seek evidence and information from a wide range of sources. It should be conducted by people eminent in accounting, the law and financial administration, it should review the implementation of program performance budgeting. It should examine some of the comments of the Auditor-General about more effective accountability. It should examine the role of SAFA as the balancing item in the budget. It should examine the ability of Parliament to scrutinise the Executive's financial management.

It should be asked to recommend an administrative structure which will ensure that performance and accountability are central to the process of planning, budgeting, approving expenditure and evaluating its efficiency and effectiveness afterwards. It should consider whether the Government should have a five year financial plan, available to this Parliament and to the public, which forecasts revenues, determines spending limits and debt ceilings under specific functions, and estimates year end budget results. I propose this as the only remedy now available to this Parliament to repair the breakdown in accountability and overcome the obsession with secrecy which has become a hallmark of this Government's financial management.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): I will make a couple of comments about the operation of the two Estimates Committees on which I

served. First, fortunately the Minister of State Development and Technology was far less voluble this year than he was last year. Following last year's Estimates Committees I made some comments in debate about this and obviously they struck a respondent cord, because the Minister mentioned them in his opening remarks to the Committee. Last year I suggested that the Minister should use his departmental advisers more often because they sat in their seats all day like deaf and dumb mutes. This year the Minister did just that and, accordingly, he had less to say—it was not too longwinded and he let his advisers respond to some questions.

I was interested to hear the Director of State Development and Technology make some comments, because he had precious little opportunity last year. I do not think the business community will receive much joy from the Director's description of the role of the firm of consultants Dominguez Barry Samuel and Montagu. I asked the Minister what his department had paid that firm and the Director responded, I think, that it is paid a retainer of \$20 000 a year. It seemed to me that that amount would not buy much in the way of expertise in terms of what that firm would provide to South Australia. After further questioning we heard that Dominguez Barry Samuel and Montagu could fish out business from information gathered after setting up deals with South Australian companies or assisting South Australian companies to resist take-overs. The press releases which led me to ask those questions indicated that the business community was worried about the role of Dominguez Barry Samuel and Montagu in that it believed that the firm was using inside information to feather its own nest. In fact, the Director's response indicated that that is the position. I do not think that the business community, which is concerned about the operation of this firm, received much joy or comfort from the answers that the Director at least was prepared to give to the Committee.

Apart from that, we also had a good supply of information about submarines until we had submarines running out of our ears—and questions came mainly from the member for Briggs. The Minister was happy to wax eloquent about submarines. Unfortunately, the submarine king, Mr Duncan, was not there. I would have liked to question him about his economic competence in view of some of the statements he has made—but I will leave that for the moment. In relation to the Department of Mines and Energy, the Minister is not really the most electric of performers and he did not really set his team on fire. Nonetheless, he answered questions and he gave—

Mr Olsen interjecting:

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: He is not what you would call a powerhouse, no. The departmental advisers had a good go and I thought that the Committee was quite satisfactory and it covered a wide range of topics. We heard that energy labelling will be introduced in South Australia to assist the public when buying appliances because they will be able to ascertain how much energy each appliance uses under a five star (I think) rating system. The Committee also canvassed the enormous downturn in mineral exploration in South Australia. The Minister attempted to indicate that that was a national trend and that the Government could do nothing about it. I do not quite share that view and I do not think that the mining industry does, either. The Minister told us that in the near future he will make an announcement about a mini refinery at Stony Point. I do not know what 'in the near future' means in terms of the Government's timing, but we wait with bated breath to hear what is happening in that area.

I will make one or two other points during this debate. First, I reinforce the point that Australia is in a big mess and South Australia is in an even bigger mess in terms of where we are going and where we are at the moment. I have referred previously to publications and information, largely based on Bureau of Statistics figures, which indicate this fact quite markedly. We have referred to the fact that population growth is the slowest of any of the States. That was a big deal in 1982 and the Premier, with those crocodile tears, was telling us that we were losing our most precious resource—our people—and tearing at the old heart strings. It almost made one weep, but of course it was not true then, although it is true now. We have the worst record in terms of net migration gain, whereas under the former Liberal Government of the Playford years we led the nation.

We know that in employment growth we have the second worst record and in terms of overtime worked we have the worst record; in building approvals—the worst record; in home loan affordability—one of the worst records; in retail sales growth—the worst record; new motor vehicle registrations—the second worst record; and in bankruptcies—the worst record. We have heard all the huffing and puffing by the Minister today about WorkCare and the fact that it is too bad that, if small businesses happen to be operating in the service industry—where a lot of them are—they will have to carry the heavy export orientated industries.

Let me just quote one example brought to my attention last night of what the Government is doing in terms of trying to help small business. The Government conveniently forgets, with its WorkCare thinking, that it is in small business, as defined, that the vast amount of our employment is generated, sustained and maintained. I believe that well in excess of 80 per cent of all employment is in small business. This is a sector in which the Government did not appear to be very interested. The Minister, in his WorkCare answers today, certainly indicated that these people will carry the burden for these so-called export wealth earning industries that he talks about.

A case in my electorate that was brought to my attention involved a painter who, I guess because his accountant advised him, formed a company, of which he was the sole employee. His wife contacted me with these figures. My constituent is complaining about what is happening under the present Government. One cannot get a smaller business than a one-man company, and in order to paint houses this one man must be licensed under the builders licensing regulations. That procedure has now been put under the jurisdiction of the Department of Consumer Affairs.

In 1979 the licence fee to enable this man to paint and decorate houses was \$43.75; from 1982 to 1985 it was \$43.75; and from 1985 to 1988 it has been \$87.50. Now he not only has to apply to the Department of Consumer Affairs for his licence as a painter, but he must apply also for the company. Although he is the only employee, the only one doing any painting, he has to pay two fees and he also has to apply and register as a supervisor: he has to be classed as a supervisor to supervise himself. That will cost an extra \$30. So the sole employee of this one-man company must get a licence because he has a company name, he must get a licence for himself because he is a painter, and he must have a licence for a supervisor in order to supervise himself. So, the total cost of those fees is \$175 a year before he lifts a paint brush.

Yet this Government talks about not increasing taxes and charges significantly. It also says that it is trying to get rid of red tape, but what better example of red tape could one find than a one-man painting firm that needs two licences: one to paint and a supervisor's licence to supervise himself.

It is absurd. The licences cost that man \$175 a year for the privilege of painting and decorating houses.

The Minister is not worried about small businesses that must pay an increased premium for WorkCover even though small businesses provide the large bulk of employment around the nation. While they complained that they need two licences, one for the company and one for the supervisor, they also mentioned WorkCover. The company employs him: he is the sole employee of the company. The company must declare the man as an employee and he must declare himself as an employee simply because the firm is registered as a proprietary company. As he must pay a WorkCover premium, he must now pay a premium of 4.6 per cent of what he pays himself to cover himself, whereas previously he had a private arrangement.

That reinforces the point made by the Minister in reply to a question this afternoon: the Government is not interested in small businesses. The small businesses in the community that are carrying large employers via WorkCover will be interested in what the Minister had to say in his reply today. He said that the Government was deliberately taking on people who were good insurance risks and making them cover the risks incurred by other sections of employers. How the Government justifies that in the name of equity I do not know and, when it becomes more widely known, there will be even more disquiet than there is at present.

The Minister of Mines and Energy was asked during the Estimates Committee what had happened to the Silicosis Fund to which miners contributed to help workers, especially those in the quarrying industry, who were affected by the disease silicosis, which affects the lungs as a result of the powdered silicate in the air. That fund has accumulated over \$4.5 million, but the incidence of silicosis is now virtually nil because of improved work practices. I asked the Minister what had happened to the fund because the mining industry is concerned; it does not want the Government to gobble up what is after all its money. The Minister said that the fund had been subsumed into WorkCover, but that would not please the industry. In fact, the industry was afraid that that might happen.

The recently published Auditor-General's Report does not mention the Silicosis Fund, even though it must be audited each year because it was set up by statute. I rang the Auditor-General and, in his usual courteous fashion, he gave me the information that I required. Whether the Minister knows it or not (but I suspect that he does not know) WorkCover will have to keep that money in a separate fund. The Minister's simple reply that the money had been handed over to WorkCover for its purposes was not correct. Indeed, it had better not be correct, because that would be a breach of the law. The Auditor-General said that his officers were investigating this matter and that the fund must be kept separately. The mining industry believes that the money originally contributed by it and the considerable interest that has accrued should be used for the benefit of the industry, and I certainly subscribe to that view.

I asked the Minister what Government work would flow to Amdel now that Amdel had been privatised. Before the Estimates Committee, we did not get into all that about privatisation, commercialisation and the doublespeak of the Premier, but from the budget papers it appeared that Amdel would not get the same flow of Government work as it had enjoyed previously. I did not get much response from the Minister to my question, but I was interested to read only last week that the Government or Amdel had gone a step further in its privatisation plans and that Amdel had joined with Conlabs, a Western Australian firm, so three major

functions of Amdel in mining and processing will become totally private. There will be a public float on the market. How does the Premier describe this situation in the light of his statement that he would not privatise Amdel but commercialise it?

The Premier was so voluble prior to the last State election in condemning what the Liberal Party was talking about and our friends in the trade union movement spent a couple of hundred thousand dollars misrepresenting the Liberal Party. He said that we could not have a bar of that word but what does he say now about the joining of Amdel with Conlabs and having a public float to finance it, while it is expected to have a turnover of about \$14 million a year? Surely, that must be described as what everyone knows as privatisation—public subscription to a public company.

So much for the garbage that the Premier and the Labor Party have gone on with in their semantics about commercialisation and privatisation. At least the Right Hon. R.J. Hawke has been honest enough to talk about what he has talked about. He makes no bones about his desire to privatise certain large Government enterprises including the airlines, because he knows perfectly well that, as a result of the way they are going and with the debts incurred since his Party has controlled the purse strings in Canberra, there is no way in the world that those airlines will be able, with only Government funds, to re-equip with the aircraft that will be needed soon.

Senator Walsh knows that, too, and he has been making the right sort of statement about where we are at in terms of the Commonwealth budget. The Prime Minister at least is not a complete hypocrite, although he is a hypocrite in terms of what he said before the election and what he seeks to do afterwards. However, he does not persist with this myth of not being about something when he is really about it—privatisation. So, good luck to Amdel which has taken another major step down the privatisation path, a step about which the Government has been strangely silent.

Another matter about which questions were asked in the Estimates Committee concerned country payroll tax. How does the Government get around the statement, made by the Premier when he launched his glossy publication, *South Australia's Economic Future*, on the eve of the most recent State election? In that publication, he gave a clear assessment of the country payroll tax scheme, and he gave a clear commitment to continue it. The publication, which has a foreword signed by the Premier, was put out just prior to the election. It states:

In South Australia's economic future, the next five years . . .

Here we are, two years down the track since this statement was made. At page 59 he said:

Also, following detailed examination of the country payroll tax and land tax reimbursement scheme, the Government has endorsed its continuation.

There it is—for the next five years. He further stated:

The South Australian Government will continue to provide payroll tax and land tax rebates to eligible firms. Withdrawal of assistance to regional enterprises at this stage of the recovery in the State economy would be potentially damaging to the economic viability of some firms and regions which rely heavily on continuous provision of tax rebates.

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

The Hon. E.R. Goldsworthy: I haven't warmed up yet!

The ACTING SPEAKER: I know that, but the time has gone.

Mr MEIER (Goyder): I am happy to move for an extension of time for the honourable Deputy Leader, if I am permitted to do that.

The ACTING SPEAKER: The honourable member is not.

Mr MEIER: In that case, I will address the budget estimates myself, but I point out that I am very sorry that the Deputy Leader—the future Deputy Premier—was not able to complete his remarks. However, all the information that he put forward simply highlights how this State is perhaps not being managed correctly, and the budget Estimates Committee hearings certainly brought that out clearly.

I was pleased to have the opportunity to sit in on several Estimates Committee hearings, in particular those dealing with the education, Attorney-General, agriculture and water resources portfolios. It is always a little disappointing that the available time permits the asking of only a certain number of questions, although at least it was heartening that this year a few of the Ministers in the committees at which I was present did appreciate that they should keep their answers relatively short and to the point. I believe that that was not the case at one or two other hearings, where Ministers decided that in response to certain questions they would expand the answers to the fullest possible extent.

In relation to the education area, it was enlightening for me to receive answers that I had been waiting for, for a long time. In relation to the Moonta Area School, I first took up this matter with the Minister of Education on 12 March this year—nearly seven months ago now; at the time of the Estimates Committee hearing it was a good six months and some weeks. I reminded the Minister that I had written to him about the atrocious condition of the exterior of the Moonta Area School, where a board had fallen off part of the roofing structure, the paint had deteriorated completely, and white ants were in the buildings. When we were visiting the school my wife, who was wearing high heeled shoes, was warned that in some places she could go through the floor. It was quite an embarrassment to some extent to have to go through part of the school. I took up this matter with the Minister and I again brought it to his attention during the Estimates Committees. I asked him whether he was going to reply on this score. Without going into all the details of the Minister's answer—and I respect what he said—it was very heartening to receive a formal reply last week—in other words, within a week of my having brought up the matter in Parliament.

This type of thing disturbs me, because Estimates Committee hearings are held only once a year and one would not get very far at all if one had to let one's correspondence pile up while waiting to ask at the Estimates Committees why certain matters had not been attended to. Nevertheless, it is heartening that some \$85 000 will be spent on the Moonta Area School. Let us hope that there will be fewer white ants around the place, a bit more paint and better floor coverings.

Talking of floor coverings, I think we must give full credit to the many teachers in this State who have provided their own floor coverings in schools. On a number of occasions it has been brought to my attention that the floor coverings of a school were by courtesy of Miss Smith or Mr Jones. The fact that such teachers have brought floor coverings from their place or have bought them is a reflection of the way in which education has gone in this State, with teachers being called on to provide so many services or, shall I say, small luxuries.

Moonta will look a little bit better: although some of the problems that I raised will not be attended to, I will detail that on another occasion. I had not heard from the Minister about the Minlaton Primary School, so it was great to get his answer, because a deputation had been requested. The Minister said to me that he hoped that he would be able to

arrange a personal visit to Minlaton Primary School in conjunction with another request that I had made. I thank the Minister. Again I say that it is a pity that I had to wait for the Estimates Committee in order to get a firm commitment.

On page 51 of the *Sunday Mail* of 4 October in the 'Opinion' column a letter appeared headed 'No fat to chop in our schools', written by Mr Noel Johnston, who is Chairman of the Minlaton Primary School Council. I quote the letter because it is very relevant, and members opposite will be educated from listening to it. Mr Johnston said:

Randall Ashbourne's article on Government cost cutting, 'There's more fat to chop' was a good example of selective journalism: fix up school cleaning, rationalise the school bus system, and South Australia is back on the road to prosperity.

It is lively simplistic stuff which ignores the very real problems faced by schools which are falling rapidly into a state of disrepair.

There is wood rot in our old classroom block, paint is peeling off and rust holes are developing in roofing.

One classroom has developed big holes through termite damage while in another, floor supports have given way causing a hollow in one section. Slopes are such that pencils will not stay on a flat desk. Floor coverings are a mixture of old carpet squares supplemented by cast-off carpet from the golf club.

These conditions would not be tolerated in industry nor in government offices.

For our children it seems, anything is good enough.

Parents increasingly are being called upon to provide funds for furniture, floor coverings and the like and our children are not getting value from our tax dollars.

By all means trim the fat but don't look for it in the schools.

That is another example of a school in which things are anything but rosy. For over 20 years, the Minlaton Primary School has asked to be considered for upgrading and, more importantly, to shift the site. The school is located on three separate sites split by two roads, which the children have to cross every day they are at school. It is pleasing that, as a result of the budget estimates, the Minister will come and look at the problem. I hope that action will occur after his visit or that the school will be put on a definite priority list. Minlaton Primary School is a living example of how the buildings of our education system are in urgent need of repair. Unless the Government addresses the problem, it will deceive itself and the public of South Australia that it is a caring Government. Indeed it has already become clear that the Government lacks care in some areas.

A third education problem that I was able to bring to the Minister's attention related to the air-conditioning system in the community library at Balaklava High School. This matter has been brought to the Minister's attention twice. The construction of the community library is relatively new, but it has a very low ceiling and a reasonable number of windows in some sections so that in the summer it becomes very unpleasant to work in. The problem was first encountered last November when the air-conditioning system started to give up, which it finally did in the following months. It did not operate much of the recent summer, yet many months have passed without any action being taken. When I brought it to the Minister's attention during the Estimates Committee, he indicated that he felt these things could be remedied better by being handled by officers of the department.

I have no objection at all to that. I would love the officers of the department to fix this up. The trouble is that we seem to be pushing our heads against a brick wall. We have already experienced the first hot weather this season and, unless action is taken forthwith, many students, staff and community members who use this library will suffer during the coming summer. I trust that this matter will be addressed soon. I have requested a deputation, but the people of Balaklava and I are happy not to have a deputation, so long as something is done to remedy this problem forthwith.

The other education matter that I raised during the Estimates Committees related to playground equipment. I am not the only member who raised this matter during the Estimates Committees as it has been around for some time. This highlights the anomalous way in which instructions are given to schools: directives from the Director-General may conflict with those from the Department of Housing and Construction, even though the Department of Housing and Construction provides the directives in both cases. I will explain this matter a little further.

During the Estimates Committee I referred to a circular which came from the Director-General and which was dated 17 July 1986. Entitled 'A Circular to Principals of Schools and Chairpersons of School Councils: Management of School Playgrounds' that circular states that it is quite all right to use clean washed natural sand (in other words, beach sand) in playgrounds and to have kikuyu or buffalo grass around playgrounds. That instruction was issued by the Director-General. However, the 1987 playground manual issued by the Department of Housing and Construction states that sand of all types is unacceptable and is not to be used. That document further states that, as a result of testing, it had been found that grass and natural sand were also unacceptable and should be replaced with one of the recommended materials. Obviously, schools are in a state of confusion in relation to this matter.

The Minister suggested that we put matters in chronological order. I am happy to do so, but let us make sure that directives from the Director-General are reissued so that they can countermand any previous directives, because to the best of my knowledge this still has not been done. Are schools to ignore directives from Directors-General, or do they use their own better judgment? I wish that they could. For example, the Edithburgh school playground was closed as it was considered unsafe because of the material around the playground. In that case the school people were unable to use their better judgment. That playground has been reopened for some time, but the people involved do not know whether the sand that has been used is acceptable. One Director has said that it is and another that it is not. It is at times like this that South Australia is becoming so over-regulated that people must shake their heads and wonder why Government action is not taken to get some common-sense around the place.

The final education matter which I raised and about which I was not satisfied by the answers given related to music teachers. There is no doubt that country people are discriminated against with respect to the availability of music teachers accessible to their schools. In fact, statistics show this quite clearly. I will now give some statistics relating to full-time equivalent music teachers in certain areas.

In Adelaide, there are 26 full-time equivalent music teachers; in southern there are 23.5; in northern, 10.7; the eastern area, which is a country area, has 10.7; and in the western area, another country area, there are 7.2. Most of Goyder falls into the western region, and has only 7.2 full-time equivalent music teachers. We have been fighting unsuccessfully for the past year or two to try to get that number increased. However, teachers have to be reallocated within the school, so that means that other subjects are missing out. Therefore, there is certainly a discrimination against country students attending schools if they perhaps cannot be offered a full subject range that the principal or the senior staff would like to see offered.

I certainly acknowledge what the Director-General said, namely, that he is very proud of the music program. That is fine: so am I where schools have full access to the

different facilities that are available. But, let us see, Mr Minister, whether we can have a more equitable situation throughout the State. I get sick and tired of the Minister's saying how good our education system is, knowing full well what discrepancies exist and how so many students in country areas are missing out. If he is going to make statements, he should back them up with action; otherwise, he should please refrain from making such statements.

I also had the opportunity to be on the agriculture Estimates Committee, and I would like to highlight one or two things that arose there. I refer, first, to country slaughterhouses and the South Australian Meat Hygiene Authority. I am worried about the direction that the Meat Hygiene Authority is taking with respect to its inspection policies. The member for Victoria pointed out in the Estimates Committee that the Meat Hygiene Authority was introduced in 1980 to enable it to oversee the upgrading of country slaughterhouses to an acceptable level. It was anticipated that, once that job was done, they would be wound down. Typically, they are not being wound down but seem to be being wound up.

At present they propose to examine country slaughterhouses on a regular basis—I think about seven times a year—at an annual inspection charge which will run into many hundreds of dollars per slaughterhouse, and there are about 78 slaughterhouses in the country regions. Why can we not hand back that responsibility to local government, which it also has its health inspectors? We heard about the possible problems of meat and how South Australia was in a pretty good situation. We are talking not about meat being inspected but about the actual buildings, and I believe that local health inspectors would have as good an understanding as anyone.

When replying to that matter, the Minister said, 'But you will not get the same uniformity.' Many examples exist with different inspectors coming out, and their uniformity was conspicuous by its absence. The sort of inspection depended on who came and when he came, so that is no argument. I trust that the Minister will reconsider that area of slaughterhouse inspection so that country people are not burdened with the extra cost of meat as a result of increased inspection fees.

I also mentioned the problem of the Sitona weevil, which infests Yorke Peninsula and which is a real nuisance in summer. It feeds particularly on the clover grasses and such like. Having asked how the eradication program through the introduction of wasps was going, I was very disappointed that the Minister said it was not a priority. Dr Radcliffe also indicated that he felt it was not a real problem any more. Well, if anyone came onto my back lawn at certain times, they would see that the Sitona weevil problem has increased in the past few years. However, as the Minister and his adviser have said that it is not such a problem, I will take particular note during the coming summer.

I will check out the position on farm properties a bit more to see whether my deductions from past years are correct. I am sure that I was not imagining things. They can be treated in a straightforward way with appropriate wasps. That has been shown through the use of the alfalfa weevil in America, and I believe that we can learn from that. I was very pleased to have the opportunity to contribute in the Estimates Committees, and I have made my views clearly known in this place.

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

The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD (Chaffey): I have supported the concept of the Budget Estimates Committees since the day

we first introduced them. However, I am somewhat disappointed with the situation concerning certain portfolio areas, and I refer particularly to the portfolio areas of the Deputy Premier, in view of the magnitude of the number of portfolios that he holds and the fact that only one day is given to the Deputy Premier's portfolios. This means that large departments under his control receive scant consideration by the Estimates Committee. That is a great pity, because the Estimates Committee has a great role to play in the parliamentary system of this State.

If one divides the portfolio areas of the Deputy Premier into various departments, one notes that two hours is allocated for the E&WS Department. Of that, one hour is taken up by Government members' questions, leaving the Opposition with only one hour in which to examine the program and performance of the department. The E&WS Department is a massive department by South Australian standards. It has a large budget and a large capital works program. However, only one hour of questions was available to the Opposition to inquire into the department's performance, and that makes an absolute farce of the Estimates Committees.

That is not to say that the Estimates Committees are not a good idea. Indeed, I believe that they are a good idea, but serious consideration should be given by the Government to extending the time allocated to particular Ministers. I suggest that the Deputy Premier, for one, should be prepared to front up on two days, rather than one day, simply because of the number of departments for which he has accepted responsibility under this Labor Government. Some Ministers have a much lighter ministerial workload, thus giving the Estimates Committee a reasonable opportunity to examine their portfolio. Certainly, no-one in this House could possibly expect the Opposition to delve fully into the program and performance of the E&WS Department in only one hour of questions. I refer to the number of the department's employees and its wide responsibility across South Australia. I refer to its responsibility in rural areas for about 22 000 or 24 000 km of pipelines across the State.

I ask the Government to consider asking Ministers with a large portfolio area to be present for two days before the Estimates Committees next year, so that their portfolio responsibilities can be more adequately canvassed. We have seen a dramatic increase in the size of South Australia's budget, particularly in the past five years of the Labor Administration. However, the capital works program is being reduced. The hospitals program has been cut back, and the water supply and sewers program has been curtailed. There is no doubt that this Government is a high taxing Government by Australian standards, and that it has dramatically increased the revenue available to it. Where is the additional revenue going—to pay for the enormous increase in the size of the Public Service and in the number of people employed by statutory authorities (somewhere in the vicinity of 13 000 people) since this Government came to power five years ago?

I also refer to the increased interest payments of the State's debt. These payments now total some \$686 million annually, and this compares with \$460 million in the last Tonkin budget. This is 16 per cent of the State's expenditure and means that \$686 million is not available for programs involving the essential services to which I have referred, namely, hospitals, water supply and sewers.

One should look more closely at what the Government is providing in the water resources area. As I said when the budget was introduced in this House, there is no commitment by this Government in relation to the problems of the Murray River, and very little commitment about the

water resource needs of this State and the capital works program necessary to maintain the quality of water and, in fact, to improve it. The average quality of water in South Australia is not up to the standards set by the World Health Organisation. Enormous capital needs to be made available to ensure that the standard of water in South Australia for potable consumption is up to World Health Organisation standards, whereas at present, in many instances, it is not.

Another important matter canvassed at length in the Estimates Committees was the depreciation and the replacement of fixed water resource assets. The Liberal Party has raised this matter on numerous occasions over the years and there is still no clear answer about how the Government will come to grips with replacing the State's massive capital investment in the form of underground water and sewer mains. The Government is living in hope that somewhere down the track technology will find a way whereby existing mains and sewers can be effectively relined, thereby extending their life indefinitely.

While there have been some developments in relining existing water mains and sewers, it still has not reached the stage where mains and sewers will not have to be totally replaced in their own right. This dilemma is highlighted by a notice from the Australian Institute of Urban Studies. We would have all received a registration form in our letterboxes at Parliament House when we were invited to participate in the seminar, which is to be held on Friday 16 October, on this very subject. The registration form is headed 'Rust, Dust and Bust: The Asset Replacement Dilemma'. Clearly, the Australian Institute of Urban Studies is very concerned about the dilemma to which I have referred in this House and during the Estimates Committees over the years on a number of occasions.

It is very interesting that the institute should organise this seminar at this time, because there is still no real answer in the budget papers as to how the Government intends to approach this problem. In the budget papers a figure has been listed for depreciation, but when we questioned the Minister and the department on that topic, it was ascertained that that money has not been set aside and it is not in a special fund within the Treasury to enable the department to proceed with a replacement of assets program.

Of course, when we talk about the replacement of mains, sewers and other essential services, we are not just talking about metropolitan Adelaide: we are talking about the whole State. As I mentioned earlier, we are talking about something like 22 000 or 23 000 kilometres of water mains across South Australia which provide stock and domestic water to the rural areas and to towns in country areas of this State. I am very interested in the outcome of this seminar. It is interesting to note what the brochure says, as follows:

In an era of declining public resources and highly competitive demands for public expenditure, choices for spending priorities will become more and more difficult. A burden which will fall on the public sector, in addition to those arising from new demands, is the foreseeable need to replace ageing and potentially troublesome public assets, including pipes, wires, roads and buildings.

It has been suggested that economies can be achieved by making better use of the replaced assets, by changing urban form and housing types. In that way, new investment required to expand the metropolitan area may be reduced.

Such an answer would require changes to the nature of the city. It would probably result in other effects on its people, including lifestyle and societal changes. How big is the problem? What are the implications? What are the best solutions?

Obviously, the institute is just as concerned about the long-term effects on South Australia and the difficulties that future generations will face in coming to grips with this very vital problem.

We noted with concern that, in relation to the Department of Marine, as a result of the disastrous fire some time ago

the Government made a very bold statement and commitment for a new fuel container berth at Port Adelaide. However, no provision has been made for that. In fact, the Government has altered that proposal and is merely upgrading the firefighting facilities at the existing berth. In the long term that is just not good enough. Once again this involves essential services—the supply of fuel to this State—and unless we are assured of top facilities, not only for the supply of that fuel but also in relation to the safety of people who live and work in the area, we will certainly not progress in the way that we should in this State.

I refer now to a matter that I believe should be taken up by either the Attorney-General or the Premier. As the Crown Lands Act stands at the moment in this State a third party who is granted an easement across a property owner's land, virtually as a favour, has a registered interest in that property. The power that the third party has over the person who grants the easement as a favour (so that the property can be effectively worked) is quite remarkable. In my opinion the extent to which that third party can hold the property owner to ransom is beyond belief.

Two cases have come to my notice in the past few months where this has occurred. The first case involves a person with an easement or registered interest over another person's property who has been able to stop the property owner from doing what he wants to do with his own land because he must obtain the signature of the person with the registered interest. I think that is absolutely appalling, and it is a situation where a third party with deliberate intent has exercised power over someone else's property. The other case involves a person with a registered interest for easement over a property who has now passed away. The property owner has been trying to sell his land for the past two years and is under pressure from the Department of Agriculture to meet a repayment on a rural industries loan. The property owner has been served with an order from the Minister of Agriculture to the effect that, unless he pays the outstanding sum of some \$25 000 within one month, the department will proceed to sell his property. However, the Government's own legislation has stopped this person from selling half of his property, which would have realised the necessary money to satisfy the rural industries loan.

Yesterday I raised this matter with the Department of Agriculture and I was told that at this moment it will not take action to sell this person's property. That is only proper because the property owner is in this extremely difficult position as a result of the Government's own legislation. The Minister of Lands has been approached and he has responded to the effect that he recognises that this problem does exist within the Crown Lands Act and he has acknowledged that the Government does intend to amend the legislation. However, it is a matter of when this necessary amendment will be made. In the meantime, the property owner is in a bind purely because the third party who was granted an easement originally as a favour has died and cannot sign the necessary document to permit the sale of the property, so it is not as a result of any intent to be obstructive. For two years this person has not been able to sell his property. The debt that he owes the Department of Agriculture has been mounting daily. The matter is totally in the hands of the Government. The whole situation has been, and is, an absolute financial disaster for this person.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD: I do not recall a situation similar to this arising when I was Minister, but if it had I would hope that it would have been—

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

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK (Light): I rise to take part in this the last occasion on which members of the House have an opportunity to directly debate issues associated with the budget. However, I want to point out that it is not the last occasion on which the ministry has the opportunity to perform in relation to the budget. More specifically I refer to the promises which the Government made during the course of the Estimates Committees to provide answers to members of the House (Government or Opposition) and to get those answers out with a minimum of delay. I am pleased to note that already the Premier and the Deputy Premier have circulated a number of answers that were promised on those occasions. They are the only answers that I have received to date, yet I am fully appreciative that there are a number of other questions which both of them promised to address but about which information has not yet been forthcoming.

I want to take up the point which was made by the Chairpersons of the two Committees that the Ministers and their advisers were required to make these answers available by a given date. If my memory serves me correctly, that date was 9 October, which is the end of this week. That in itself is one deadline. The other deadline which I alluded to on the very first day of the Estimates Committees—and which I want to draw attention to here today—is that the Government has the responsibility to ensure that the consolidated answers which have been promised from the committees are incorporated in the special *Hansard* edition and circulated at least no later than three weeks from 9 October. I say that because last year it was almost four months, in fact, after Christmas, before the consolidated answers were made available. That is a slight against Parliament itself.

It is all very well to say that these answers were made available to the members who raised the issues, but in many instances they were raised on behalf of other members and it was not always possible for the reply to go back to the person who raised the matter. Therefore, the person who had a direct interest in the question that was put on behalf of a colleague was left in abeyance until that final document came forward. I believe that the Premier gave a clear indication that it was his expectation that due diligence would be given to the production of that document. This is in no way a reflection upon *Hansard*; it is the production and the subsequent distribution that is all important.

In relation to the information which was made available during the course of the Estimates Committees, I would have to say that I was genuinely satisfied with the attitude expressed by three of the Ministers in the Committees that I attended. I was less impressed by the information which was made available by the Hon. Barbara Wiese, Minister of Local Government and Minister of Tourism, who sought to be the font of all knowledge and who went on, and on, and on with answers not necessarily directly associated with the question put, and almost cut out the opportunity of officers, who were the font of knowledge, to provide simple and straightforward answers. I have heard my colleagues here this afternoon indicate their appreciation of the information which was made available by officers in the presence of their Minister and which was concise and to the point. I would hope that on the next occasion the Minister of Local Government will take heed of these comments, improve her performance and allow her staff to perform for the benefit of the Committee.

The answers were not necessarily total. We saw an excellent example of two Ministers, the Minister of Marine and his colleague the Minister of Transport, both as Minister of Transport and in another portfolio area, when questioned in relation to Supply, handling the question of the *Island*

Seaway like a very hot potato. They were offering all sorts of suggestions as to how quickly they would get material or get answers, but nothing has been sighted, and we still have a ferry, a new vessel, tied up to the wharf and not performing as it was supposed to have done some considerable time ago. There are still no answers from the Minister to questions which were placed here without notice before the break and questions placed to those two Ministers during the Estimates Committees.

It is a vital matter, which was well to the fore in the mind of the Auditor-General in the announcements made to the House in the Auditor-General's Report earlier this year. It is just such an issue which may well become the subject of an Auditor-General's report specifically to the House in between the tablings of his annual reports, because there are some scandalous aspects of that whole exercise which need to be answered, and need to be answered quickly, to the benefit of the knowledge of people in this place and the people of South Australia.

In relation to the Deputy Premier, my colleague the member for Chaffey has already drawn attention to the impossibility of that Minister or the members of the Committee doing real justice to the three major portfolio areas that that Minister has to manage. To give the police lines, for example, less than 1½ hours of questioning on a budget that traverses a tremendous area of public and community interest, expending in this current year in excess of \$160 million, at the same time, giving less than 45 minutes to the Metropolitan Fire Service and less than 45 minutes to the Country Fire Services, the other emergency services, and indeed the Auditor-General, is a very poor examination of some very important lines.

Representations were made to the Minister on an earlier occasion that due consideration ought to be given to his taking some of the time not necessarily required by some of his colleagues with lesser portfolios. To date that has not occurred, and again I express the view that it is long overdue and will allow the whole system of Estimates Committees, to which I believe both sides of the House are committed, to function more positively.

In relation to the activity of the emergency services (and I include all of them), it was interesting on Thursday evening last to attend a dinner at the Police Academy to wind up the eleventh Natsarcon Conference, which was attended by representatives of the police, the armed forces and other emergency services of the States and Territories of Australia. That group of people, who had been in attendance at Fort Largs between 29 September and 1 October, considered a very large agenda and looked at many of the areas of cooperation which are necessary between the various emergency services.

It was very clear, from talking to a number of people from interstate, that they were more than happy with the response that they have had from the various South Australian services. There was in fact a demonstration off O'Sullivan Beach on Thursday afternoon of last week, a simulated air crash, complete with the disposal of the wing into the sea and its recovery and the subsequent recovery from the 'downed' plane, of persons who were found in the sea or washed up on the shore, the only access for those people's recovery being up and over a steep cliff. The police and other emergency services responded and reacted one with the other very effectively, giving an able demonstration to these people from interstate and from the armed services. They were loud in their praise at the dinner on Thursday evening. I also take off my hat to Chief Superintendent Des Critchley, who was the South Australian police coordinator

responsible for making sure that everything functioned well during the conference.

It was interesting to note, in relation to one of their items regarding marine search and rescue, the grave concern of a number of Governments about the large cost of mounting a sea and rescue activity for, in many circumstances, hoax calls or situations where the person who is in trouble has created the problem for themselves by going out ill equipped, going out without knowledge of navigation or with no due regard given to the forecasts and no opportunity being taken to listen to the changing weather pattern as is frequently made available over the airwaves. Indeed, it became quite clear at that conference that many Governments are looking at cost recovery in relation to these matters or compensation for the services to ensure that their budgets do not blow out to the detriment of other vital services in the community rather than large sums of money going down the hole without there being any real return for it.

It is great to have these people standing by. The amount of voluntary effort and out-of-time effort put into a number of these services by professional people and volunteers—people who go out of their way to make themselves available for the safety of others—is being discounted, rather unfortunately, by people who do not assist in their own destiny.

We find, in relation to the examination of the police lines, that, whilst there is an increase of funds available to that organisation, the number of police officers available for direct service to the community will diminish during the year. New Government initiatives—the red light camera, an increase in breathalysing testing, and so on—will mean that officers will be taken off duties that are quite important to the community to be deployed into these new initiative areas. On behalf of a number of people I represent and country people in general, I register grave disquiet at the disbandment of the stock squad, which has provided over many years a very successful operation in bringing to justice a number of people who, with modern day trucks, travel long distances to rustle cattle or steal sheep. They also have had a major involvement in taking equipment from shearing sheds and away from homestead implement sheds.

I find it difficult to accept that the small group of people who have provided this service will be disbanded and put into other areas. They will still be available, but not in the integrated form which existed in the past. The gathering of criminal intelligence, likewise, will be adversely affected by other changes which will make it difficult to find the numbers to put these people into the field for the new initiatives. The new initiatives, in great part, are there not only to try to reduce the road toll but, very clearly, from the estimate of income figures which were provided to the committee and in the documentation that we had, are expected to provide large sums of money for the State coffers. It is unfortunate when the police of this State are placed in a position of being tax gatherers on behalf of the community and, in some circumstances, being refused the right number of people actually in the field to provide education and the feeling of safety that the community is demanding.

This afternoon I had delivered to me an answer to a question which I had placed on the record more than 12 months ago as a question on notice. It related to the number of declared major crimes, and the reply makes interesting reading. Although it has taken the Government over 12 months to answer—and I cannot for the life of me understand why that should be, except that it has been able to include the total of the 1986-87 figures—it does show that the Police Force in South Australia has had a very worthwhile clean-up record of designated major crimes. In fact, apart from the information which will appear in the answers

to questions on notice, I have taken out a brief table which relates to the percentage of clean-up, solved and unsolved crimes, from the period 1980-81 to 1986-87, and I seek leave to have that inserted in *Hansard*.

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

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: I can, Sir.

Leave granted.

PERCENTAGE OF MAJOR CRIMES SOLVED

| Year | Percentage |
|---------|------------|
| 1980-81 | 58.8 |
| 1981-82 | 58.1 |
| 1982-83 | 69.2 |
| 1983-84 | 70.4 |
| 1984-85 | 79.3 |
| 1985-86 | 72.0 |
| 1986-87 | 71.6 |

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: Also, it has been possible to draw from that information details of the number of murders or attempted murders during the same period, and to show the number of deaths recorded as suspicious deaths rather than manslaughter, murder or attempted murder. I have a brief table which indicates that information and which I seek leave to have inserted in *Hansard*.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Is this table also purely statistical?

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: Yes.

Leave granted.

DECLARED MAJOR CRIMES

| Year | Murders and Attempted Murders | Suspicious Deaths |
|---------|-------------------------------|-------------------|
| 1980-81 | 6 | 0 |
| 1981-82 | 13 | 3 |
| 1982-83 | 12 | 1 |
| 1983-84 | 10 | 1 |
| 1984-85 | 10 | 3 |
| 1985-86 | 16 | 5 |
| 1986-87 | 9 | 3 |

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: The table shows that we are fortunate in having a very worthwhile Police Force, albeit under some stress as a result of the decreased manpower which is to be made available to it. It is also unfortunate that the question of police integrity is being clouded at present by suspicions relative to one or two officers. That is most unfortunate, and I trust that those matters can be resolved and got out of the way without a great deal more lost time, to the benefit of the Police Force in total.

Very quickly, let me say in relation to the Country Fire Service and the Metropolitan Fire Service that it was interesting to note from answers given by senior officers of both organisations that there has been major cooperation between the two; that they are using a common radio frequency; that they are using facilities for training on a joint basis; and that there is a clear indication of the responsibilities of the two groups. However, it has not prevented them from showing that element of cooperation which is also very apparent between the other emergency or volunteer services. I refer to the St John Ambulance Brigade, the State Disaster Organisation, and individual groups within the community, such as the CWA and the Women's Agricultural Bureau, who assist these organisations in times of need.

We need more cooperation so that we get a more effective dollar benefit. In that regard, I am pleased to report that questioning at the time of the Estimates Committees showed

that in the Country Fire Services area the preparation of a standard form vehicle, as opposed to a series of Rolls Royces and Austin 7s, is working to the benefit of the Country Fire Services. We already have some of the larger tankers, of 3 000 litres capacity, in the field, with other 2 000 litre tankers to come onstream, and supported by a \$1.1 million capital line for the Country Fire Services; this will give us a better service in the field, and it is high time that that occurred.

Mr LEWIS (Murray-Mallee): I want to begin by mentioning what I would like to refer to with some emphasis—but I am unable to do so—namely, the fashion in which, for instance, even presiding officers of the executive committees do not seem to understand the way in which the Standing Orders were intended to operate. In this instance, I am not reflecting on you, Mr Deputy Speaker, in your other role as Chairman of Estimates Committee A, but rather I am reflecting on the unfortunate experience that I had in Estimates Committee B, where the person responsible for presiding over that Committee seemed to be more preoccupied with a perception of what the Estimates Committee should relate to and chewing the cud than of what is my understanding, anyway, of the way that Estimates Committees were intended to be conducted. In these circumstances, there is never an opportunity to raise the matter of conduct of the affairs of an Estimates Committee during the proceedings of the Committee.

I just hope that, in future, the Government provides these Committees with presiding officers who not only understand the way in which the Parliament intended that they should work to provide information to members of Parliament about the purposes to which Government is to apply money but who also have some respect for the forms and procedures of the House as laid down in Erskine May and not provided for in our Standing Orders. For example, it is a long-standing convention of this Parliament and other Parliaments that members of Parliament, when they are either in Committee or in Parliament, do not eat, and I think that all members ought to be aware of that. I have mentioned it to those members who do eat but should not, and they seem still to persist in the practice—I think it is disgusting.

Some problems created by Government spending policy have caused concern to my constituents and to other organs to which they must relate and upon which they rely, and I am referring to organs like local government. One knows that it would be unfair, I am sure, to expect local government to provide infrastructure facilities from ratepayers' pockets for buildings and other facilities that have been established by the State Government for the benefit of the State taxpayers at large. I shall give an example with which I am sure members will be in sympathy. The Mobilong prison has been built near Murray Bridge and is about to be opened. I understand from reading the press that it is to be opened in about two weeks time—by the Minister of Correctional Services, coincidentally.

The Hon. D.C. Wotton: Have you been invited?

Mr LEWIS: No, I have not been invited. It happens to be smack in the middle of my electorate, and I would have thought that the Minister could give me an invitation at about the same time a month ago when he invited a number of other people to that event. However, I will not be distracted by a grievance of that nature. Let me return to the matter that I wanted you, Mr Deputy Speaker, to consider, along with other members of the House, namely, that the prison has been built out in the middle of open paddock not far from Murray Bridge in an appropriate place, goodness knows, and there is nothing to connect the prison to the outside world.

There is no appropriate roadway other than an unsealed track that is not even well surfaced. It was adequate for the vehicles that needed to use it during the construction phase, and it was not the only means by which access was gained to the site. However, now that the security fence on the perimeter has been completed, ready access from any other direction is absolutely out of the question and quite impossible. There are no other buildings at the end of the track, yet the State Government has told the District Council of Murray Bridge and me—in spite of repeated, reasonable requests and submissions to it on the point—to 'Go fry your face'. A heavier rate must be applied on the ratepayers of Murray Bridge so that they can meet the cost of establishing a suitable sealed access road to the prison. That is not legitimate or reasonable in any way.

During the Estimates Committees I did not have the time or the opportunity to raise the matter with any of the Ministers involved. The narrow interpretation of the presiding officer frightened me from attempting even to raise the matter with the Minister of Transport, who is responsible for highways, because the provision of a road to the Mobilong prison was not in the budget papers: so how on earth could I raise a question about it? I could not relate it to a specific line (it did not appear) so I did not bother to churn myself up and burn the rubber off my tyres on that matter during the Estimates Committee. However, I believe that it would have been legitimate for me to question the Minister of Transport, who is responsible for the construction of roads at State taxpayers' expense, and the Minister of Correctional Services and the Minister of Housing and Construction. That they could have embarked on a decision to place a prison in the middle of a paddock with limited access to it and demand that the local government body in the location in which the prison has been built extend and upgrade that access is totally unreasonable.

Another matter that I had no opportunity to raise during the course of the Estimates Committees was the dilemma now confronting the State and the nation, for all I know, about the occupational health and safety of workers in the meat industry. I am surprised that this matter has not been raised in the House by members on the Government benches. The people who work in abattoirs, all of whom were in recent times vaccinated in a trial program of more than 12 months duration, can no longer obtain vaccinations.

The Government has simply decided not to make Q-fever vaccine available. Because it was not mentioned in the lines, it was not possible for me to raise this matter in the Estimates Committee with the Minister of Labour. Nor was it possible for me to raise it with the Minister of Health or have one of my colleagues do so because he was so eloquent in his prolixity that he precluded the opportunity. That really means that he talked a lot of ruddy nonsense for so long that we did not get the chance to ask questions.

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr LEWIS: This is not nonsense. If the honourable member talks to the recently recruited meatworkers at the abattoir at Murray Bridge, and the abattoir not far from the boundaries of his electorate at Noarlunga, he will find that they are very angry and disturbed. The union has found that it can no longer require management to help. Management wanted to cooperate in the provision of vaccination for meatworkers against Q-fever but they can no longer obtain the vaccine. Neither the Minister of Health nor the Minister of Labour or any other member of the Government front bench has addressed the problem realistically at all.

They have left it to the unfortunate member for Bonython, the Federal Minister for Health in the House of Representatives, who has required the Commonwealth Serum Laboratory to cease production of the serum and to call for a review of what is to be done about the provision of Q-fever vaccine. Abattoir owners were not asked whether they were willing to buy the vaccine to enable their line staff, those people working as slaughtermen, and so on, to be vaccinated. New employees in abattoirs now face a real risk of contracting this disease without having had any opportunity to be immunised against it, and the Government could not care less, yet an opportunity did not exist for me to pursue this matter.

I turn now to another matter that I found extremely curious and unfortunate because of the way in which the Estimates Committees are conducted; that is, a comparison of the Liberal Party's performance when in Government with that of the Labor Party under the direction of the present Premier, the Hon. John Bannon. It needs to be remembered that the 1982-83 budget, the first budget under this Government, was, in fact, a Liberal budget. It needs to be remembered when making comparisons between the period that the Hon. David Tonkin was Liberal Premier of this State and the period of this current Government that that year was definitely not one for which the Labor Party could claim either credit or responsibility for the fiscal policies pursued.

We know that in 1979, directly after the election, the first thing that the Parliament did was address the budget. The Tonkin Government made substantial changes in the budget papers prepared by the defeated Corcoran Government, the most significant of which was the abolition of succession duties as from 31 December that year. Out of this comparison comes the fact that the present Bannon Labor Government is a much higher taxing and bigger spending one than the former Liberal Government. Outlays have increased by an average of 4 per cent in real terms every year—and I quote an average figure compounded on the previous year's figure—contrasted with an increase of less than 1 per cent during each year of the Tonkin Government. Taxes have increased by an average of 9 per cent during the time that this Labor Government has been in office, that is, in the four years to 30 June 1987, whereas the Tonkin Liberal Government decreased taxes during each of its four years in office.

Mr Tyler interjecting:

Mr LEWIS: In each of the four years, I remind the member for Fisher, who says that it was death duties; he obviously does not know the difference between the two taxes—death duties are a charge on a deceased estate, while succession duties are charged on the proceeds distributed to the beneficiaries of an estate. It is also noteworthy that the Labor Government has increased spending since 1984 only because it was possible to obtain increased taxation revenue, as well as funds from SAFA, the State Bank, royalties on projects that it had very little to do with, and dividends obtained from its service enterprises. It had increased grants from the Commonwealth in 1984 and 1985 as well. In the past two years, deficits have increased because of a decrease in Commonwealth grants, the deficit for the year ending 30 June 1987 estimated to be \$496 million. That is a huge increase, increasing the debt and resulting in a very much higher interest bill to be paid by the citizens of South Australia. The interest Bill alone last year was \$700 million, which is 16 per cent of total expenditure.

If that is the kind of record of which the Premier is proud, then I say on behalf of my constituents, 'Shame on him,' because the effect of these taxes has been to increase costs throughout the rest of the economy. Indeed, the only way in which the people concerned can relieve the burden of taxation is pass it on to people to whom they sell goods and services. This eventually results in increased wage costs involved in the production of those goods and services as workers try to maintain their position economically.

I refer to those people who do not have the opportunity or the facility to obtain higher prices just because their costs of production have gone up. They are price takers; they sell their produce on world markets. World markets do not have the control imposed on them like that exerted by some big international arbitration commission. Just because Australian farmers have higher costs is no reason at all why they should in any way expect to get higher prices for their commodities overseas.

The regrettable thing is that members opposite come from backgrounds that do not countenance that phenomenon, and they do not understand it. The tragedy of members on the Government benches is that not one of them has had any experience in running a business. They have not had the responsibility of investing, as it were, taking a risk with their own grub stake, the shirt on their back, in an attempt to make a living for themselves and their families, as well as trying to expand their enterprises and employ a greater number of people than just themselves and their immediate families. They have never made a success of doing that in a fair market in respect of which anyone is free to enter and compete. Members opposite believe in the closed shop principle, where big unions get together with big Governments and big corporations—big business—in order to make deals and screw the rest of us in the process. We, as individuals, end up paying for that sleazy arrangement and it is constantly being churched in the Arbitration Commission to the detriment of the economic health and welfare of this country's future.

It is illustrated by the indifference that the Government has shown to the way in which it will borrow money and make commitments for the repayment of that money and the interest on it not next year, the year after, or five or 10 years hence but 30 years down the track when the children of children to be born tomorrow will be in the work force and will have to pick up the responsibility for the repayment of that debt.

Either that, or the Government is incurring debts on which it knows it will ultimately renege. In such circumstances all of us need to recognise that we will be regarded by the world community as being no more or less reliable than a country like Argentina or Mexico, being incapable of keeping our word, irresponsible in our contractual obligations to other nations who lend us money.

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

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON (Heysen): At the outset, I express my support for the concept of the Estimates Committees. I had the opportunity this year to serve on a number—environment and planning, police, emergency services, local government, tourism, housing, public works, health and community welfare—and I appreciated the opportunity to question Ministers on budgetary matters, as well as on matters relating to the aims and objectives of the various departments for which Ministers have responsibility.

At the outset, I indicate that I find that the opportunity was somewhat frustrating as well. In the committees in

which I was involved this year I recognised more filibustering on the part of Government members. Much greater opportunity was taken by Government members to put forward Dorothy Dix questions. That was obvious on all of the committees on which I sat, and it is most unfortunate. As has been said (and I do not want to go over the comments made by my colleagues), the opportunity is there for Government members to sidle up to their colleagues, who are Ministers, to gain information. Generally, Government members have more opportunity to speak with ministerial assistants to get information, and it is a great pity that time is taken up by members in this case through Estimates Committees to get the sort of information that could be obtained through other means.

Also, I found it rather frustrating because of the many questions that could be asked. I recognise that the shadow Minister on each committee has the major responsibility. It is an ideal opportunity for them to seek information on budgetary matters, particularly, and it would be foolish if shadow Ministers did not take that opportunity but, as a member of the committee, it is difficult not to get frustrated about the time taken in waiting one's turn.

I wish to refer to a couple of matters in which I have had a particular interest in Estimates Committees. First, in environment and planning, I reiterate what the member for Light said earlier about the extreme difficulties with which we were faced through the small amount of time made available to question the Deputy Premier on matters relating to environment and planning, emergency services, water resources, etc. In environment and planning and police and emergency services, I would have liked greater opportunity to raise questions relating to those portfolio areas. As the member for Light said, the small amount of time that was given to questions of the Minister of Emergency Services was a problem. I refer to the Metropolitan Fire Service and the CFS, in particular. The CFS is under the ministerial responsibility of the Deputy Premier, and I would have liked much more time to ask questions.

One of the matters we discussed in that brief time with the Deputy Premier and some of his colleagues relating to the environment and planning portfolio was the determination of future urban growth areas and his recent announcement about the decision that had been made in that matter after a long wait—some 12 months at least. I reiterate what I have said in this House on a number of occasions—that one became tired of the number of times the Deputy Premier suggested that an announcement was shortly to be made. I recall at least three occasions when the Minister indicated that a decision was about to be made, yet we have waited well over 12 months for that announcement to be forthcoming.

While I am pleased that Mount Barker was not determined as a future urban growth area, I have some concerns about the way in which the Government is going about future urban growth in this State, as far as the city of Adelaide is concerned. We have been told that the two year study has shown that the State Government's objectives should be to contain Adelaide's growth within the existing urban area and not develop housing in fringe zones. Mount Barker was one of the five outer metropolitan areas involved in the study, the others being Roseworthy, Sandy Creek, Virginia, and Willunga. Development was frozen in those areas after the State Government released a report in 1985 identifying the alternatives for future housing growth. We have been told that State planning policies will be changed to implement policies to accommodate Adelaide's growth by providing more houses in the existing suburbs, as well as a greater variety of housing types; and I support that

concept. When I was a Minister in the Tonkin Government I put forward that proposal, and I support what the Minister is attempting to achieve.

However, I understand the practical problems in achieving that policy. We have been told that areas around Virginia and Mount Barker will not be developed for housing and will remain rural in character, and should any future fringe development be required into the next century it will be located in the Gawler area or around the Aldinga township. I have some concerns about that urban consolidation policy. It ignores the reality of growth in the Adelaide Hills. Whether we like it or lump it, Mount Barker and the surrounding district is bound to grow. It is all very well to say that urban consolidation is the right way to go, but how will the Minister responsible for this very complex area force people to develop and stay in the suburbs? There is no way that that will happen. The policy does not recognise the important role that Mount Barker is playing in syphoning urban growth from the metropolitan area of Adelaide.

Many people do not want to live in the city—in urban areas—and they prefer to live in semi rural areas such as Mount Barker. Government policy will not stop those people from going out into those areas, and Mount Barker will naturally continue to attract people. My major concern is that if Mount Barker is not recognised as a growth centre it may not receive the financial assistance for the town's infrastructure that is needed over the next decade. The new policy is by no means the complete answer to this problem and I fear for the future of Mount Barker because I cannot see that it will receive the assistance that will be required for the growth of that area now that the decision has been made.

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

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: Mr Deputy Speaker, I draw your attention to the state of the House.

A quorum having been formed:

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: I referred to some matters that I raised with the Minister for Environment and Planning during the Estimates Committees and I will now continue with a couple of those issues. One that causes me particular concern relates to the new building regulations that have been introduced in bushfire prone areas in the Adelaide Hills.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I call the House to order. I draw to the attention of the House the Standing Order that states that, when a member is speaking, all other members must remain seated. I would ask the House to extend the courtesy to the speaker of listening to what he is saying.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: I had the opportunity to bring to the notice of the Minister my concerns and the concerns of local councils which are now being given the opportunity to comment on those regulations. Most of the concern arises as a result of problems associated with liability, to which I referred in the Committee stage. I suggested that all Hills council planners within the fire prone area of the Hills must take into account the advice of the CFS officers who have been appointed to decide whether or not building development applications can proceed. If the CFS says 'No', a building development should not proceed, the planner and the council approve the application on condition, then, should a fire occur and cause damage to that property, liability is a matter of considerable concern.

I am aware that already councils are saying that some applications cannot be approved and I know of five examples where applications for building approval have gone to a council and been rejected on the advice of the CFS officers. I am concerned about that matter, because it gives

enormous power to five or six people and it takes building and planning approval out of the hands of the council and its planners and places it in the hands of CFS officers.

I recognise that there is some need for regulations to be introduced in regard to fire protection measures relating to building houses in that area, but for some time I have been concerned about these regulations. I am concerned that they have gone overboard and that they have not taken into account the liability problems. Further, I am concerned that, at this very early stage, there are examples where people are being refused the opportunity to proceed with building applications.

I hope that that can be sorted out and that the Minister listens to the concern being expressed by councils throughout the Hills in relation to this matter. There is no doubt that people who wish to build new homes or extend their homes in this area will be faced with increased costs and much uncertainty. I trust that there will be some sympathy in regard to the concern felt by councils in relation to this matter.

The other matter, which I raised with both the Minister for Environment and Planning and the Minister of Tourism, relates to problems being experienced by people in the Hills who wish to provide bed and breakfast style accommodation. In fact, I took a deputation to meet the Minister for Environment and Planning, and the Minister of Tourism was also present. The deputation informed the Minister of the difficulties being experienced mainly as a result of regulations under the Building Act whereby people who are prepared to accommodate people in their homes face all sorts of problems, particularly in relation to fire prevention measures. I am pleased that today I received a reply from the Minister of Tourism suggesting that the issue of bed and breakfast style accommodation will be considered by the Building Advisory Committee at its next meeting. The reply also states:

The committee will examine the proposal to amend the building regulations so that premises providing accommodation for no more than five unrelated persons will have the same requirements under the building regulations as those imposed on normal domestic residences.

Discussions have taken place between officers of the State Heritage Branch, Department of Environment and Planning and officers of the Department of Local Government regarding conflicts between the Heritage Act and Building Act. Amendments to the Building Act are being drafted to enable these conflicts to be resolved.

This is a matter of extreme urgency.

The Hon. Jennifer Cashmore interjecting:

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: That is very much the case. In fact, many people have accepted bookings from people who will be visiting Adelaide to attend the Grand Prix. I am aware of the other side of the problem whereby councils are concerned about giving approval for this type of activity to continue when they know that the letter of the law is not being followed. As I said, I was pleased to receive that reply and I only hope that the Minister will recognise the urgency of the matter.

During the Estimates Committees I tried to find out what was happening regarding insurance recovery in relation to the demolished information bay on Mount Barker Road. Members may remember that some time ago a new facility was made available for advertising for tourism purposes and to welcome people to Adelaide and at that time I expressed concern about the scandalous cost of that facility. In reply to a question on notice I was informed that the facility cost \$120 000; but I understand that since then the cost has risen to \$136 000.

Those of us who travel along the Mount Barker Road on a regular basis were amazed one morning not that long ago

to find that the whole thing had been demolished as a result of an accident involving a semitrailer. So the \$136 000 has gone by the board and I understand that there is now some concern on the part of the Department of Tourism and those who were involved in the erection of that facility as to whether or not any form of insurance will be paid out. Whatever replaces the now demolished Adelaide information bay at the Pastor Kavel lookout on the Mount Barker Road needs to be much more practical and far less expensive. The structure which was built late last year at a cost of \$136 000 was demolished only a week or so ago. On a number of occasions I have described as scandalous the expenditure of \$136 000 on this facility. It has proved to be totally impractical and an absolute white elephant. It is imperative that visitors to Adelaide and the surrounding districts are made to feel welcome and are made aware of appropriate tourist information. For this reason alone I hope that those responsible give much more thought to how a facility such as this can work most effectively and cost a lot less.

Another matter that I wish to refer to briefly relates to comments that I have made recently regarding the involvement of the Department of Housing and Construction in playground equipment in schools. I made a statement expressing my concern about the confusion that was being experienced by school principals and councils following varying advice from the Department of Housing and Construction. As a result of that statement, on a couple of occasions the Minister, through the media, has asked for my apology. I have no intention of apologising to the Minister or the department. This is a matter of considerable concern and I ask the Minister once again to seriously consider clarifying a lot of the concerns and confusion currently being experienced by school councils in this regard. It is a concern that has been noted for a long time; the matter is extremely important and should be considered as one of urgency.

Mr S.G. EVANS (Davenport): First, I want to express my usual concern about the effectiveness of Estimates Committees and how they have, in my opinion, decreased the democratic process of our Parliament just that little bit more. When Estimates Committees were first established everybody said it would be a great idea; members would be able to question Ministers, public servants would be here to help the Ministers, and more information would be made available to Parliament. In fact, it has put more power in the hands of the executive of both major political Parties. It has, in effect, said to those who may be in minority Parties or Independents that they do not count, and that the members who elected them have no real right, through their members of Parliament, to make their representations or to endeavour to gain knowledge that may be of benefit to that elected member. Some may say that such members can sit until the end of questions by the major Parties and then you will get an opportunity. That is a ludicrous waste of time, because usually a member is able to ask a maximum of only two or three questions.

What has happened? A multitude of public servants on very high salaries, higher salaries than members of Parliament, sit in the Chamber for hours and hours, answering a lot of political questions, with the Government members of the day trying to stonewall, to protect a Minister as much as possible—and it happens with both political Parties—and the Opposition trying to play up political points ready for an argument later on if it can find a flaw in the Minister's argument or the information provided by the departmental officers. I do not say that that happens all of the time, but it happens much of the time.

Instead of finding out how departments work or how money is spent, we fail. We fail a lot because the papers we receive contain a lot of detail, but not the sort of detail that is likely to give members the information that will enable them to go to the root of troubles in the departments or to find where money is being wasted. It may be better if Parliamentarians did not ask questions at all, if the Opposition and Government backbenchers were permitted to have, at the people's expense, accountants and lawyers to do the questioning, and thereby take it outside the hands of elected members. We have taken it outside the hands of most of the elected members under the process that now exists because under the old system—

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr S.G. EVANS: I am not advocating that we do it; I said it may be better, not that it would be perfect or the right way. Under the old system in this House Ministers had to stand up here and attempt to answer the question themselves, and every member had a chance to ask questions until all questions had been asked. The most important part of Parliament or Government is how the State finances are run within departments. That is the most important role, and Parliamentarians should make the judgment, whether in Opposition or in Government, on whether the Executive of the day, Cabinet and departments, are running the State well and using the moneys correctly. Yet we put time limits on it.

We go to the Estimates Committees and, long before questions have run out for members we say that that is enough time, that is the end of it. There is not enough time to find out all that happens, but rather a time is put on it. If one were given enough time to follow through all details by all members of Parliament, with public servants here and Ministers lined up, the system might work. It may take an extra three or four weeks, but surely that is the most important role. We do not sit many weeks as it is. I did not even bother. I got out of the State—I admit it.

Mr Becker: You went on holidays.

Mr S.G. EVANS: I did more good than the member for Hanson did in making out that he had an interest in some subjects, because the information does not help anybody. There is no encouragement under the present system, because in the position in which other members and I find ourselves in this place the chance of being able to ask questions is denied. Parliament is supposed to be a place where members can ask questions.

The same applies in general business. One can wait for weeks before getting up to ask a question because the Executive is taking over in every field and the same thing is happening in political Parties. We should realise that that is one step—the first step—towards destroying democracy once we start to step away and say that elected members of Parliament do not have at least equal rights in the general running of the Parliament. We do not do that under the current process. I have belonged to and worked with a Party and know how it operates, but we need to make an assessment as members of Parliament of whether or not we are going down the right path. So, I express my doubts.

The member for Heysen raised the issue of building regulations. The Minister for Environment and Planning and his department can draw up all the regulations they like about the types of houses to be built in a bushfire area or the types of building material to be used, where the house can be sited on the building block, and so on, but it will not make one iota of difference to the number of houses destroyed in a bushfire unless we do the most important thing, namely, enforce provisions on how people care for their properties. Everyone in the Hills has learnt that lesson.

We have placed an extra burden on people wanting to build a house without giving any security whatsoever that the future of that house will be safe unless we enforce the provisions of precaution in the management of the property. If we do that, no matter what conventional building materials the house is built of, it will be safe or at least as safe as possible. We have passed and enforced a set of regulations upon society and councils.

As the member for Heysen said, we have brought in CFS officers to stand on an allotment and say, 'We do not think we can build a house here because it is in a fire danger area and is the wrong sort of house—you cannot build it'. Somebody may have paid \$50 000 or more and no less than \$25 000—their life's savings—for a block of land, to be told that they cannot build a house on it and that their piece of land is valueless. That is the truth of the matter. If one is denied the right to build any house on an allotment because a fire officer says that the allotment is not safe, one has lost one's life savings. It does not matter to the rich: the rich can afford to go somewhere else, but the people—

Mr Gregory interjecting:

Mr S.G. EVANS: The member for Florey might want to swap bank accounts with me one day; he might get a shock. If he wants to make those sorts of interjections, good luck to him. But, the rich can afford to go somewhere else: the poor and the middle range income earners are trapped, yet they have as much right to live in that Hills area as does anyone else. I do not believe that CFS officers—and I know them and respect their ability to fight fires and advise people how to take fire precautions—are qualified to make that sort of finite decision about a person's future and the use of a person's land.

I believe that if I went and asked them privately, in confidence, 'Do you feel that you are competent and confident in your ability to do that?' most would say, 'No'. The member for Heysen comes back to the point of liability. I say that if we are going to leave in those regulations let us make it a provision that a CFS officer can say, 'I do not believe you should build there: the council says that a risk is involved', we could have that as a condition on the approval and, when the person lives in the house, he should have to declare it to his insurance company or, if he sells the property under the form 90, he should have to declare it on the form 90 so that the intending purchaser knows the risk involved. The insurance company would also know the risk involved, and could load the policy if it liked. We would not then have the complications that we have created for ourselves at the moment.

In relation to bed and breakfast facilities, I think I was the first to promote that in this place back in 1974 as a policy that should be adopted. I am pleased that it has occurred. However, if the Minister sets up a new set of regulations to say that people taking five non-family members into a property need to build only to the same standard as an ordinary household, what will happen to the motel—and I will not name it—which is already built, which holds a lot more than that and which does not meet those requirements? Will it be put out of business? Although it has approval and is operating now, the risk still exists.

I believe that we would get into too much regulation, because I do not believe that there is a risk if the normal precautions are taken and if the CFS officers are given those sorts of powers to make sure that the precautions are taken, whether it involves a motel that is two storeys high or a split-level building of timber construction, particularly if it is in a township area. So, we need to look further than has been suggested in the letter that I believe the member for Heyson has received.

What of Kalyra Hospital? I must take the opportunity to say that when I inspected the building I learnt that the Minister of Health had never been inside Kalyra Hospital; no Government architect has been there for 10 years; and no senior member of the Health Commission has been inside the building in a similar period. Yet they say that the building is not up to standard and that it must have \$12 million spent on it. I say here—and I cannot use the word that I would like to use—that it is an untruth. It is not factual. The Minister will not know any different, because he has not been there. However, someone fed him that codswallop, and the Minister should be man enough to go and have a look and say, 'I am not trying to close it on the basis that the hospital is not up to standard.' The service is magnificent; the buildings are in excellent condition; and the environment is great for people who, in the main, are there for a short or a long term before their life expires. The support services are there, as are the volunteers and the counselling services. It is a magnificently run hospital.

If there is some other reason why he wants to close it, the Minister should be honest and tell us what it is. I admire the member of the Upper House, the Hon. Gordon Bruce, for going to have a look. I think it would be good if his colleagues and the Minister asked him what he thought of it. I know that it is hard for a Minister to back down—in particular this Minister who is involved—but it is an opportunity to show faith in those who work at that hospital, the service that they give and the facilities that are provided. This issue will be fought and it will be fought for a long while.

If ever there was a time for a group of people in this State to get together and to form an association to express concern about the Government's mishandling of the truth and the facts and about its disregard for the disadvantaged position of the sick and elderly in this State, it is now. This would involve a group of people who were determined to work together to bring down this Government, whether associated with the Goodwood High School, Kalyra Hospital, the Hills railway, the proposed major southern arterial road to serve the southern community, or Jubilee Point—all the projects that the Government has failed on. I believe that there are enough people out there now who could become motivated and set to work to ensure that the community does not forget the Government's feeding of misinformation to the community in order to achieve the socialist goal.

I now refer to a matter that I was hoping to raise during Question Time. I will raise it now just in case I do not have an opportunity to raise the matter by way of a question. I have raised this matter with the Minister of State Development and Technology and Minister of Employment and Further Education, and he is aware of it; if I do not get a question up, he might get the opportunity during this debate or at some other time to give me an answer.

The Carrick Hill proposal has worried some residents living nearby, and it will be the subject of a select committee report. But, now the community in the area also has another concern. It has come to their knowledge that a company called Bresatec Limited, in which the Adelaide University holds I think a 40 per cent interest, with private interests holding the balance, intends to start a small industry on the Peter Waite land. That land was left by Peter Waite for education and agricultural research, and maybe some other minor matters; but, they were the main purposes of the bequest.

It is a large piece of land, and the Waite Research Institute, the adjoining CSIRO and the Urrbrae High School carry out an important role in the community. We are told

that Bresatec intends to undertake work with some small fermentation processes, as well as work mainly on hormones and animal genetics for the purposes of breeding better quality animals for the rural pursuits of this State. One has no argument with that sort of project. For example, we already know that pigs have been developed through those processes, and this company is also looking at other areas. But, the Peter Waite land was not left for the purposes of industry. This land is at Urrbrae, and the area is not zoned for industry, whether light or heavy industry.

Admittedly this would only be a light industry. If we are to have an institute or another technology type park in the south, this is the sort of industry that could be encouraged to set up in that area. I hope that the Minister can take that matter further. I appreciate his interest in the subject but the people of Urrbrae and nearby suburbs are concerned that it might be the thin end of the wedge for other similar types of project. Before we know where we are, a lot of other small industries will move into an area that is zoned for residential purposes or into the 200 acres left by Peter Waite. I had the privilege of going to Urrbrae in the war years.

If members of this Parliament really believe that they are elected to represent the electors in their electorate as well as the whole State, we should look at a process that gives every member the opportunity to question Ministers in the budgetary process. That cannot be done under the present system of Estimates Committees. I made that point earlier as I have made it every year. It is a farce. If we could work out how much it costs for the public servants and the pile of documents that they have to prepare beforehand for us to peruse—

Mr Becker interjecting:

Mr S.G. EVANS: The member for Hanson says that it is the only time that some of them work. I disagree with him but it is a waste of taxpayers' money and we should all realise that. Most members here did not experience the old system and do not know how it worked, but it was better and more democratic.

Mr INGERSON (Bragg): I rise to give my point of view about the Estimates Committees and to compare the Bannan Government with the last Liberal Government of five years ago. I will speak also about the State Transport Authority and its magnificent ticketing system—the one that pops in and pops out yet never seems to validate—and the lack of funding for the Highways Department.

I note for the fourth time this year that the Bannan Government is a high taxing Government. In addition, compared with the Tonkin Government, it is a significantly heavier spender of our money. In 1979, some \$820 million in taxation was collected in this State. In the three years of the Tonkin Government it dropped each year to just over \$740 million. It can be seen from the same graph that, after the Bannan Government was elected in late 1982, the figure rose from just over \$740 million to \$940 million in 1985 and, this year, some two years later, it has increased to over \$1 billion for the first time. The period of the Bannan Government has seen a very significant increase in taxation.

Where has the money gone? That is the next important question that must be looked at. The Bannan Government has been able to increase spending since 1984 because of increased revenue generated by taxation, the profitability of the South Australian Financing Authority, the excellent private enterprise of the State Bank, royalties and dividends. In 1984-85 it also received increased grants from the Commonwealth. However, in the last two years, the deficit has

increased because of a decrease principally in Commonwealth grants. The deficit for the year ending June 1987 was estimated by the Australian Bureau of Statistics to have been \$496 million. That has led to an increase in net debt and a high interest bill. Last year the interest bill was almost \$700 million, or 16 per cent of total expenditure.

This Government is mortgaging our children's future. The total outlay in 1979 was \$3.7 billion, dropping in 1982 under a Liberal Government to \$3.5 billion. Between 1982 and 1986 that figure increased to \$4.4 billion, a massive increase in Government spending. Some 56c in every dollar of taxation goes toward paying this interest bill; that is, more than half the money collected is spent on interest. Those who have been in business know that interest payments are a total loss. It has been shown by many business people that unless people repay their capital debt all they do is continue to pay interest and get absolutely nowhere.

During the Estimates Committees I spent considerable time asking questions about the reconciliation of figures appearing in the estimates papers and the program performance budget papers. I found it quite amazing that after five or six years of using this program we could not be presented with a simple reconciliation between the figures appearing in the white books, the raw dollars and cents shown as income, revenue and expenditure, and the program performance budgeting figures, which give detailed expenditure on particular lines. I am not an accountant, but it seems fundamental to me that this process should be carried out. The Auditor-General said quite clearly this year that it is about time the Parliament got its house in order in this area. I hope that next year the Government will show a reconciliation of the figures appearing in these important budget papers.

As most members of this Parliament are not accountants and do not have significant economic backgrounds, it is important that programs are set out, as knowing where expenditure occurs is more important than sitting for hours trying to balance budget figures or work out how many people are employed in each department. These facts should be presented to the Parliament in a simple way.

It was interesting to note, in relation to the Motor Registration Division, the Minister's comment to the Committee that the process that resulted in a 10 per cent increase in registration fees and an increase of 16.75 per cent in licence fees was the result of a simple rounding off exercise; that exercise added an extra \$10 million to the budget and came from people who drive motor vehicles. That was a deceitful method of raising an extra \$10 million from the community, and it is the sort of exercise that should be pointed out to the public; we will do that whenever this sort of scandalous approach to the raising of finance is used.

It is interesting to note that there has been a significant falling off in pensioner patronage of the State Transport Authority. Our public transport system is supposed to be the Rolls Royce transport system of Australia, so one wonders why there has been this significant falling off in pensioner patronage. It is interesting to note that, over the full year, about 6 million passengers have failed to ride on our buses, compared to last year. That brings me to believe that perhaps one of the things that the STA is doing is deciding to cut back its costs, but forgetting that people ride on buses, trains and trams if they are given a good service. Perhaps the STA has forgotten that the system must be designed for the people in it, and not simply for economic reasons.

That brings me to what must be the greatest fiasco in the STA probably of all time, the Crouzet ticketing system. Last Sunday week a new system was introduced on the buses,

trams and trains requiring the public to purchase an electronic ticket, either in a multi-trip form or a single form, to take it on to the bus, tram or train, and to push it into a little validating machine to continue their journey. That is a very simple exercise, something which I believe could be introduced into the community.

Mr Tyler interjecting:

Mr INGERSON: I am surprised that you can do it. According to the Minister about \$150 000 was spent in telling the public how to use the system. In the past seven days almost 50 per cent of travellers boarding the vehicle have not known which way to put the ticket into the system. Installed into the buses and, in particular, the trains, have been very expensive validating machines that would not even work. Last Tuesday on the Gawler train, there were 13 validating machines and not one of them worked. What happened to the checking system that was to test this \$10 million exercise? It started off at \$4.5 million and is now at \$10.5 million and going up, according to the latest estimates. The final costs have not yet come in.

Last Monday morning I decided to check out the system. I thought I might have my first ride from Burnside into the city under this new system. My daughter advised me that the bus arrived at our bus stop at 7.55, so I got down there at 7.50 in case it was early. Our bus stop at Leabrook is the second on the route, and the bus arrived at 8.15. The poor bus driver was totally dishevelled. He had already been on two trips to the city and down to Port Adelaide. He was already 15 minutes late after two stops and there were only seven of us on the bus. It is the most amazing system I have ever seen in my life. I cannot understand the Minister saying that it will save us money and time.

Prior to this new system, 80 per cent of travellers who caught the bus purchased weekly tickets and boarded the vehicle, showed the ticket to the driver and went to their seat. Now, every single person who gets on the bus has to buy a ticket from the driver or have a multi-trip ticket and have it validated. That validating takes about 10 seconds and every bus trip will be extended by at least 10 to 15 minutes. Why did somebody not get on a bus and have a look at how this system will slow up the whole arrangement? Our timetabling system cannot be the same in the future as it is today. In other words, our servicing system to the public in South Australia must go down. We have spent \$10.5 million and the cost is still rising, but the system still does not work.

I understand that if a multi-trip ticket is placed under a magnet on the fridge, the ticket is invalidated for future use. Why did somebody not test that out? I understand that if the ticket is placed next to a magnetic credit card in a wallet for a week, it is invalidated also. Why did not somebody check that out? They are only normal, simple things that people would do in a normal day. To take it one step further, last Friday night I thought I would travel home on the bus, so I went into Grenfell Street to catch the bus which was due at 5.32. It arrived at 6.5. According to everyone else—not me, because I am a once only rider—instead of taking two or three minutes to load the bus, it took seven minutes. We immediately lost another seven minutes at the Grenfell Street stop that put us even further behind schedule. We got back to Burnside bus stop 45 minutes behind schedule.

The poor driver, the person bearing the brunt of this system, did not know where he was. He said to me that half way through the day an inspector got on and told him to hurry up and go a little bit more quickly between stops so that he could make up time. It is disgraceful for an inspector to have to tell a bus driver to hurry up to keep

on the schedule because of the ticketing system introduced, a system that was not even checked.

Talking on Thursday morning I had the privilege of visiting a primary school. I asked the kids how the new ticketing system was going. They said it was wonderful because they did not have to validate their tickets. They said, 'The machine goes beep, beep, beep. It does not validate the tickets.' Who checked out the system? As the House knows, if the kids in our society know how to get around something, they will be the first to do so. Already by Thursday last week children knew how to get around the ticketing system, so what is wrong with the STA? Why did we not have someone properly checking out the machines?

Members interjecting:

Mr INGERSON: I was at the school last week. The kids immediately told me how to avoid the validating system.

Members interjecting:

Mr INGERSON: In explaining to members opposite, I brought a group of children to Parliament and we went back to school afterwards. We thought we would go to the railway station on Monday. What happened? First, we found that most of the people had tested out the validating machines and again they did not work. More than half the people on the train on Monday had free rides. What were they told? They were told that the STA was not sure whether the tickets were wrong or whether the validating machines were wrong. People were told to take their tickets back to headquarters for checking. When travellers went to headquarters they found that every queue was at least 30 people long. The authorities had no tickets to swap over and people were held up again. With five bays, there were three staff, queues and no service was available.

What has happened to the STA? This is the most amazing system ever introduced in this city, and it was not checked out. It is incredible that the State can spend \$10.5 million—and the cost is still increasing—yet no one checked the system. The Minister cannot tell me that any company spending \$10.5 million on a system for all its trains, trams and buses would not bother to check that the machines worked. Why did the STA not check it? It is a simple system.

The STA spent \$150 000 to convince the public that it is the best system in the State. It still does not work, yet we still have the Minister saying that everything is okay. It is okay if people want to get to their destination half an hour late. If people want to wait for buses and line up in queues, they can go to Grenfell Street. Members should walk down there to see the fiasco being created under this new system. It is the most amazing disgrace that we have ever seen.

As to cost, we have been told that if people buy a multi-trip ticket in comparison with a weekly ticket they will save money. One can save money on a once only 10 ticket purchase provided, unlike the weekly ticket, one only undertakes 10 trips. What happens to the person who has no motor vehicle, who likes to go night shopping and wants to go out at the weekend? That person has 17 trips (on average) a week, and instead of that weekly ticket costing \$9.60 it now costs \$23 a week. We are told that the new system will make it cheaper for the public to ride on the buses, but in its first week of operation a major user of the STA tells me that he is paying at least \$11 a week more than he previously paid for his weekly ticket. The breakdown of that is two multi-trip tickets (at \$10.50 each) and two weekend day passes. This new system, which has cost \$10.5 million, does not work. So much for this most marvellous new ticketing system that has been introduced in this State.

Mr Tyler: You are very quick to judge.

Mr INGERSON: I will be very happy if the system works eventually, but it has got off to a most disgraceful start. If we spend \$10.5 million on something and it does not work in the first week, we would think that something was wrong with the system. I will now comment on the Highways Department, in particular the South-Eastern Freeway. Where are we going with the South-Eastern Freeway?

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: The honourable member's time has expired. The honourable member for Hanson.

Mr BECKER (Hanson): It is not often that anything surprises me in this House, but I was surprised today when the Public Accounts Committee advised me that this is the tenth anniversary of my membership of that august body. Having been its longest serving member and the only surviving past Chairman, I am a bit worried about the future. Unfortunately, past chairmen do not live very long, so perhaps there is a record there as well. Certainly, it was a surprise to know that I was the longest serving member of a Public Accounts Committee in Australia.

This took me back to the work and role of that committee over the past 10 years. I remember when the member for Eyre and I fought strongly and vigorously to have brought into this House the Public Accounts Committee report into the Hospitals Department which highlighted a considerable amount of waste and mismanagement.

The Hon. Jennifer Cashmore: That was a best seller!

Mr BECKER: That was a best seller all right, as the member for Coles well knows, because 18 months after the report was brought down she confirmed that we were able to save about \$14 million a year without affecting the quality of patient care, and that was a most important aspect of the report.

The Hon. Jennifer Cashmore interjecting:

Mr BECKER: Of course we improved it, but at least somebody was going to bring down a report and act on it. That is a credit and tribute to the then Corcoran Government and the Tonkin Government, and I will have more to say about the Hon. Des Corcoran later. As I said, that \$14 million did not affect the quality of patient care and has been of benefit to taxpayers ever since. That was probably the milestone as far as the Public Accounts Committee was concerned. The late Charlie Wells, who was the Chairman, came under considerable pressure from his own Party for having allowed that report to come in. However, it was Charlie's conviction that if all was not well something had to be done, and at least we achieved that aim.

The Corcoran Government was in office at that time. Des Corcoran was never a great lover of the Public Accounts Committee; he often wanted to get rid of it. However, that committee got rid of his Government because there is no doubt that that report was the watershed and led to the demise of his Government as far as credibility with the public was concerned. Of course, the calling of an early election did not help Corcoran at all.

The Tonkin Government then came to office and I was given the task of continuing the work of the Parliamentary Public Accounts Committee and ensuring that value for money was obtained. That is exactly what I set out to achieve and we highlighted many areas of poor management and waste. As a result, we were able to save the taxpayers of South Australia hundreds of thousands of dollars, and I believe, in many cases, tens of millions of dollars. The existence of the Public Accounts Committee ensured that, if we went to a Government department or a statutory authority, everybody was put on their toes to perform and, really, that is all we wanted to achieve. We wanted some of our Government departments and statutory authorities

to return to some sense of performance by management, because they had been allowed to expand. The situation was that departments almost could do as they liked and the Public Service was virtually running the Government, and that is one of the biggest dangers in any parliamentary democracy.

During my term as Chairman of the Public Accounts Committee I know that we upset quite a few people, including my own Ministers and Party. Rather tough decisions had to be taken in order that the principle and role of that committee could be preserved. It is not very nice to have to inform one of your own Ministers that, if he or his department does not produce documents to the committee then, under the powers given to the committee, which are identical to those given to a Royal Commission, we could imprison that Minister. The occasion to which I refer related to the Hon. Allan Rodda, who was a rather good friend of mine and it was not very nice to have to tell Allan that he had 48 hours in which to produce the documents, otherwise he would have to go to gaol. He asked me, 'How long?' and I said, 'Until you produce the documents.' I know that members of his branch of the Party were preparing to come up and take me to task if I took that action, but I was prepared to take it, because I believed in the role and the value of the committee. We did not have to take that action, because the documents were obtained.

The Hon. J.W. Slater interjecting:

Mr BECKER: He might have been. The member for Gilles was the Minister responsible for the Engineering and Water Supply Department and, as he would know, on two occasions his department was subjected to very close scrutiny by the Public Accounts Committee. One of the stalwarts who did not get on too well with us is now the Director-General. I remember the day that Don Alexander took us to task. I let him have his say first but, thanks to the then member for Elizabeth (Hon. Peter Duncan), he finally replied to Mr Alexander and we then got on to the business. As far as parliamentary work was concerned, it was a wonderful time and I think that anybody who has served on the Public Accounts Committee would realise the benefit and experience accrued from it. I think that it is a great training ground for any junior Minister or member. I think also that all members of Parliament should have an opportunity to serve on the Parliamentary Public Accounts Committee.

The committee gives us a direct link and insight into the operations and management of Government departments and statutory authorities and how the bureaucracy works. I remember in 1981 returning from a parliamentary study tour and bringing tapes of interviews with the author of *Your Disobedient Servant*. That book highlighted many instances which complemented the series *Yes, Minister*. When I visited Westminster I was referred by its Public Accounts Committee to the series *Yes, Minister* and I then lobbied the Australian Broadcasting Commission to bring that series to Australia. That series is one of those rare television programs that is just so true. Although the public find it hard to believe, at times that is how the bureaucracy runs the Government.

I cannot agree with the member for Davenport—I never have and never will—as to the value of Estimates Committees. We have just completed two weeks of long, hard and drawn out work. Of course, an Independent member finds it frustrating and difficult to contribute to the Estimates Committees, but that is the course he chose and he must live with it. There are many avenues open to any member—be it an Independent member or a member of a political Party—to pose questions to the Ministry or to Government departments through the Estimates Commit-

tees, Parliament itself, the Notice Paper or through normal correspondence.

So I do not believe that any member misses out. Any member has an opportunity to raise an issue in this Chamber if they do not receive answers to questions. Certainly the Premier of this State has made it clear that he expects his Ministry to answer questions on the Notice Paper promptly. However, I wish that he would insist on this, because I am quite sure that in the next few weeks this issue will be raised again, that is, that many members of the Ministry are tardy in bringing down replies for members, particularly members of the Opposition. Of course, the worst performer would be the Minister of Health, who insists on writing to members so that replies do not appear in *Hansard*.

One issue that I have been unsuccessful in having implemented is a workers hot line to the Public Accounts Committee. I would like to see the role of the Parliamentary Public Accounts Committee expanded so that public servants and/or the public could telephone the PAC direct. It would involve a hot line incorporating a toll free telephone number and members of the public could report any issue or public servants could bring to the committee's attention on a confidential basis any instance of waste or mismanagement of taxpayers' money. I feel very strongly that there should be an avenue to allow the public to pass on information. I believe that 99 per cent of the Public Service and the bureaucracy in general are honest, hardworking and sincere Government employees. Unfortunately, as in every area, there is someone who does not do the right thing and there is always someone who will take advantage of a situation.

There are occasions when the use of motor vehicles is abused. In fact, I received a reply to a question today indicating that a Government employee has been severely reprimanded for misusing a Government motor vehicle. He will probably not be too happy with me, nor will his family, but he has made it very difficult for every other employee in his department. That is the problem. I want public servants to realise that, if they receive a benefit or privilege, they should think about the other employees who share that privilege and not abuse it. You put everyone at risk if you abuse a privilege. That has been the whole purpose of my campaign about the honesty and integrity associated with the use and provision of motor vehicles to public servants. In many areas this benefit amounts to many thousands of dollars—probably \$6 000 to \$7 000. It is a little perk and in many cases it is well deserved, although that is doubtful in other cases. However, if the beneficiaries do the right thing it is accepted by those who must pay the bill. At the same time, I will not countenance any sloppy management or abuse of any system or method set up by Governments of any political persuasion.

David Tonkin was most adamant in his opposition when I suggested to him, following a parliamentary study tour in 1981, that an office within the Public Accounts Committee be set up to receive and follow through on the concerns of the public. The hot line never got off the ground and was looked on as a system where workers would rat on one another—but that was certainly not its purpose. At some time in this State I think there will be an avenue to allow the public to communicate directly with the Secretariat of the Public Accounts Committee on issues which cause concern and no doubt the PAC would look at any authentic information. Certainly in that context anonymous letters would not be accepted.

It is ironic that when the former member for Mallee, Bill Nankivell, wanted to force the legislation for the Parlia-

mentary Public Accounts Committee through this House there were two members who opposed it: the Hon. David Brookman and myself. Having voted against the legislation to establish a Public Accounts Committee I then became a member of that committee and served for a record term; but that is part of history.

I feel that the performance of the Estimates Committee left a lot to be desired. In the late 1970s I campaigned strongly for the establishment of an Estimates Committee and badgered the then Premier, David Tonkin, to set it up and to give us a better opportunity as members of Parliament to examine the Executive in the financial functions of Government. I have always believed also that the Public Accounts Committee should provide the back-up research facilities for members of Parliament who take part in the Estimates Committees. That was never accepted and I still regret that the Public Accounts Committee research staff is not available to assist members during budget estimates.

I think the budget estimates would work better if all members, be they independent or whatever, were given access to research staff prior to and during the budget Estimates. I believe this would help immensely. At present members of Parliament are left to themselves to prepare the background and do their own research, and they are challenged by the Minister and a team of experts. There is no doubt about it—when you go into bat for the shadow Minister of Health, for example, you find 15 or 16 public servants ready to advise the Minister on any issue, and knowing how the Health Commission works in South Australia—

The Hon. J.W. Slater: It would be about equal.

Mr BECKER: It would be about equal, I think: one politician to about 16 public servants. I could keep 16 of them going. I know from my experience with the Health Commission that its public servants are real professionals. I have said it before and I will say it again; they are the real professionals of the Public Service because they know how to stonewall, snow you and tie you up in knots if they want to. So you have to be really on the ball—

The Hon. T.M. McRae: Read this speech carefully when you get the chance.

Mr BECKER: I do not care, because my impression of the Health Commission has been the same for decades and it will remain the same because—and I will repeat it—they are the true professionals. They gave me a tough time and I will give them a tough time unless they decide to cooperate. But that is not my idea; my idea is to ensure that the taxpayers of South Australia receive value for their dollar. I was disappointed. I think that generous amounts of time were given to some portfolios, but for other portfolios, which I consider are extremely important and beneficial to the State, enough time was not given. For example, I believe that tourism is the greatest generator of benefit to the State. It generates business and money to the State and I believe that more time could have been given to that portfolio, using the opportunity not only to question the Minister about what she is doing but to put forward proposals and suggestions. A lot of people in South Australia are sincerely and genuinely concerned about the future of this State, they want to assist and will look for encouragement and support from the Government; not necessarily in dollars and cents, but in encouragement and incentive to participate in tourist opportunities.

I felt that in the housing and construction area we did not get the opportunities we deserved. We did not get a fair go, and nothing annoys me more than being badgered to hurry up and wind up because someone wants to go home early. Certainly, we put a lot of questions to the Minister

and he answered a considerable number of them. We will be waiting for the answers to a lot more. I was also on the Attorney-General's committee and found that he was probably the most helpful of all Ministers. He seems to be a patient person and is prepared to explain in detail.

Members interjecting:

Mr BECKER: He is very patient; he reminds me very much of the Hon. Len King, who was of the same ilk and prepared to explain and answer questions. Government Members may laugh when I make that suggestion about the Attorney-General but, although he might give them a tough time in Caucus, he performs a little better in the House and publicly than many others. It is still disappointing, as the member for Davenport said, that independent members do not get the opportunity, as they do not have the research facilities available to them. The Public Accounts Committee should do that. It is disappointing that the time given to certain portfolios is not spread properly. There must be continued support for the Estimate Committees and a determination by all members to ensure that the Estimates Committees and program performance budgeting work for the betterment of the State.

Mr BLACKER (Flinders): Many comments have been made about the operation of the Estimates Committees, and I was probably the most regular attender of those outside the Committee during that fortnight. Whilst I can see some faults with it, I believe that a Minister having his departmental advisers present means that more information is provided to Parliament and that members can achieve better answers to the questions than they did under the scheme that was proposed some considerable time ago. I note the comments made by the member for Davenport and his criticism of the committees. I also note that the member for Davenport was not present at any of the committees, as he so admitted. So, his criticism should be treated with some scepticism.

There were many instances of Ministers, and, to a lesser degree, some of the departmental advisers, filibustering. Some may have been doing so in good faith, but in other instances it could have been deliberate. In some cases questions raised were Dorothy Dixers but in others it could be put down to extremely good anticipation by the Minister and the department. Whichever way it is examined, there was on certain occasions a lot of talk but not many questions asked. By mid afternoon on one occasion only 14 questions had been asked of one Minister, and at that time something like four hours of Committee time had expired.

There are criticisms and benefits, and I trust that the House, all Parties and all members concerned can sit down and see that we get the maximum benefit from these Committees to ensure that good for the Parliament and the whole State can be achieved. Good can come from it, provided that the system is not abused. It therefore behoves every member to see that the system is used as correctly as possible.

My grave concern at this time relates to the rural situation that has evolved, more particularly over the last four weeks. Just four weeks ago I think that the rural community was correct in anticipating an average year. In many cases it was an above average year. That optimism was a relief for many people who had been facing increasing debt and debt repayments that were escalating faster than they were able to get on top of them, aggravated by extremely high interest rates. With the past four week period of dry weather we have seen those crops wither in many areas. Although previously a good return was optimistically anticipated the attitude has now become one of despair, and I do not think that anyone could describe this in any way other than tragic.

Many people can see their entire livelihoods shrivelling in front of their eyes, because they know full well that they will not be able to meet this year's commitments, let alone reduce some of the deficits that have accumulated. This air of despair is quite tragic and is something to which I do not know the answer. We cannot control the seasons and, obviously, there would be a lot of argument if we could. However, because of the tight economic situation and because farming costs have escalated at such an alarming rate and the returns in some cases have diminished—and if they have risen, it has been at a very small rate—the cost return gap has closed and in many cases the situation has reversed, so that costs have exceeded returns, even in a normal year.

We now have more and more people facing the breadline. Last year or earlier this year I was able to report to the Parliament the grave situation of certain sections of the community in my electorate. I believe that unless some miracle happens—and at this moment I do not know just what could happen—we will have an increased number of people being placed in these desperate situations and forced off the land. Some could argue that that is just the economic position and that is a matter of judgment, farming being a big gamble, anyway. I recognise that an element of risk is associated with farming. More particularly, however, I recognise that, unless farmers are able to make hay while the sun shines, so to speak, and put something away, they will not be able to carry themselves through times of drought or adverse conditions.

I have foreshadowed to the Minister that I will seek a further explanation of his comments in today's paper about the extension of financial services and client services being offered by the Rural Industries Assistance Branch in an endeavour to make sure that as many people as possible who may face these dire circumstances can clarify their position with their accountants, their bank managers, the departmental officers and whatever advisers are available to them through Government agencies. In this way they can try to ascertain just where they stand and how they can best approach the coming period, which will obviously be a considerable strain on everyone.

There is no magic wand and there is nothing that a Government can do short of handouts—and no farmer that I know of, even in the gravest situation, is looking for a handout. What farmers are looking for is a free go and, in particular, to get Government regulation off their backs and a better world economy in which their products can be sold overseas at a more profitable margin. In speaking of the doom and gloom, as one could describe it, I am ever mindful that the rural community is, in fact, governed to a very large extent by world prices.

I am also conscious that world commodity prices can be governed or manipulated by the larger producing countries, particularly the United States of America and the European Economic Community, which subsidise their producers to exorbitant levels, and the way in which they do it is quite outrageous. They pay producers far in excess of the cost of production and in excess of the cost at which our people can produce their product and put it on the market; it is therefore dumped on the market at a price that is considerably at variance with our own.

So, whilst we are competing against countries that are prepared to do that, our own producers will face very tough economic times. I should point out that there is a difference between the methods of subsidisation adopted by the United States of America and the EEC. The EEC, in fact, pays phenomenal prices to its producers for every tonne of grain produced, whereas the Americans subsidise in another way,

by paying farmers not to grow; therefore, effectively they are contributing to the control of the amount of excess grain that is held in stores throughout the nation. However, I guess what we really need is a quite dramatic drought in the northern hemisphere. Whilst one hates to wish that sort of economic pressure on any other community, that might be the only salvation for the farming community, and it would resolve the problem overnight.

Having referred to the plight of many of our producers, one is compelled to point out the gravity of the problem. Over the past 2½ weeks I have travelled quite extensively in my electorate and day after day I heard reports of despair. I am now hearing reports from some people that they will not even take their header out of the shed; in other words, the year will be a total loss to them. Their cost of planting and production has already been incurred and is already an accumulated liability on the property. So, as I have said, those people are living in despair. Of course, there are varying degrees of that—and the same applies to any rural community. However, certainly 80 per cent of the farmers on Eyre Peninsula are facing a considerably less than average year. As I have already pointed out, some are facing total loss; some will be able to regain their seed, which will only enable them to save the seed for next year's crop—if they are able to raise the finance to plant it—and others will be able to get a little more back. In some cases, farmers will be able to recoup their cost of production.

Farmers on a very small section of the peninsula can expect average yield, in some cases slightly above average. However, that involves a very small section of the peninsula. As a guesstimate, I would say that less than 5 per cent can expect an average year's return, whereas 95 per cent will be well below average, with quite a proportion of those facing a total loss situation.

Mr Gunn interjecting:

Mr BLACKER: As the member for Eyre says, the heads are there but there will be nothing in them. That is what is happening. Those people who have travelled to any of the country shows of late, particularly last Saturday and the Saturday before when there were extremely hot north winds, have been able to see what is happening. One can virtually see the crops shrivelling up during the day. That is not an exaggeration. One can notice marked deterioration of a crop during the eight-hour period between the driving to a show in the cool early morning and driving home at night. Examples of that can be found all over the place. I have made those remarks because of the gravity of the situation and, more particularly, to draw to the attention of the Government the need to make its services available now and not in six months time when everyone suddenly realises that there are no funds in the kitty, and that a financial crisis is being faced. Every farmer needs to be budgeting now to see where they will stand next February/March at the end of the farming year.

In participating in the Estimates Committees, I was able to ask a number of questions. Many other questions, which I would have asked had I been on other Committees, were asked by other members. In particular I asked about the sewage outfall at Port Lincoln. Because of the perceived pollution of an area that is becoming a tourist attraction, some concern has been expressed about sewage outfall at Billy Lights Point. There are fears in the community that some waters are polluted, but I note that some of the work being carried out by the E&WS Department has allayed many of those fears. By raising this matter, I aim to pass on the Government's assurance that there is not the risk that there seems to be. I will read from the Minister's response, which I received yesterday, to a question that I

asked during the Estimates Committees about the programming of the proposed sewage treatment works at Port Lincoln, as follows:

No provision has currently been made on the Engineering and Water Supply Department's five year capital works plan for the construction of sewage treatment works at Port Lincoln. However, the Engineering and Water Supply Department has been involved in a program of investigations dating back to 1970 to determine the impacts of raw sewage discharge on the marine environment.

Construction of a new 500 m long outfall to replace the old 180 m long outfall commenced in 1979 and was commissioned in April 1980. The new outfall discharges the raw sewage into deeper water off Billy Lights Point to take advantage of the more rapid mixing and dispersion which is possible at that location. In addition, the outfall discharges into an area which is almost totally devoid of seagrass.

One could ask why it is devoid of seagrass, but that is another story. The Minister's reply continues:

Between 1978 and 1985 the Engineering and Water Supply Department has undertaken seven separate benthic biota surveys near the sewage outfall and in other locations of Porter Bay and some further work was carried out by the Department of Fisheries in 1986. Water quality surveys have also been undertaken with three or four surveys being conducted per year up to December 1986. The parameters measured were total coliforms, E.Coli., salinity, phosphorous, nitrogen, colour and turbidity. These surveys have not shown any indication of contamination from the sewage outfall in the area at the marina at Porter Bay. The Engineering and Water Supply Department is currently assessing the accumulated body of data which has been collected over the last decade to determine what level of treatment, if any, would be appropriate for the Port Lincoln outfall.

There is a need for the Government to monitor the situation closely and to put a water or sewage treatment plant for that area on the long-term plan. Had we been starting to plan again, every one of us would have thought it desirable that the sewage should be turned out to sea in a vastly different place from that used at the moment. The decision of the Government of the day, whichever that was, was right. However, as a result of the development in the area, the position has become less and less tenable.

Another question that I asked concerned the proposed redevelopment of the Port Lincoln Hospital. I was pleased to note that the Government has set it down on a five-year program with a budget of \$6.86 million. The redevelopment is most important, and it is essential that it proceed as soon as possible. Prior to 1979, the Public Works Committee looked at and approved the redevelopment of the Port Lincoln Hospital.

I recognise that problems were associated with the redevelopment, which had to be done in stages that had to be kept quite separate from the existing hospital. There was asbestos in the ceiling, so part of the wing could not be worked on while patients and staff were in another part of it; therefore, the wing had to be shut down while the new wing was built—the old one was then redone in stages. This work was not done at the time that it was approved by the Public Works Standing Committee, but I am not critical of what happened because I recognise the difficulties that occurred, as would anyone who took time to find out what it was all about. The two Governments of different political persuasions which held office during that time recognised that those problems were not easily overcome. However, they have been dealt with and a complete and active program is under way. I trust that the program outlined by the Minister during the Estimates Committees will be maintained to ensure that the hospital is redeveloped at the appropriate time and at or below the cost mentioned.

This afternoon I met with the Minister of Water Resources about the controversy occurring in my area in relation to the issuing of oyster leases. Time does not permit me to expand on this matter, but I hope that the right decision

will be made by the Minister and Cabinet to ensure that the right thing is done.

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

Mr D.S. BAKER (Victoria): My comments on the Estimates Committees are in line with those made by other members. In particular, the member for Light made pertinent comments about how these committees should operate. The member for Hanson shares my view about how important the Estimates Committees should be; however, like the members for Light and Hanson, I think that they leave a little to be desired in their present format.

The Estimates Committees were designed initially to involve members from both sides of the House and of all political persuasions. The initial design provided a good chance for Ministers and their departmental officers to be questioned on programs for the year and on their performance. That is a most important function of any committee in this day and age. It is especially important if the Minister concerned does not have the experience or the ability to run the department for which he is responsible. That is how things should happen, and how they were designed to happen. These committees are for the benefit of the Minister, the Parliament and, more importantly, the taxpayers of this State.

In the two years that I have served on Estimates Committees they have developed into a farce. One hears question after question asked from the Government side all of which were dorothy dixers. The Minister then fumbled nervously under his sheet to find a printed reply, and rambled at length from something like a second reading speech about his or the department's policy. I am sure that these committees were not designed to be that way. Unfortunately, that is what we have seen in the past two weeks—some very good stonewalling by a Government which does not realise that it is to everyone's benefit that departmental officers are questioned and that backbench members of the Government get to question the performance of Ministers.

If they are ever going to get to the front bench, it would be handy to know that they knew something about the subject about which they were asking questions or that they may have some knowledge of the department. It is easy to be critical, but one can go through page after page of the Estimates Committees and see some of the irrelevant questions that were asked. I have noted several that were asked. The woods and forests Estimates Committee is now quite famous because the Government has at risk \$37 million of taxpayers' funds. Even though the Minister smiles and says that there is some hope, on present indications there is little hope that that will be recouped into the Treasury or SAFA, from where those funds have come. About the most stunning question asked by the stonewallers on the Government side was the following:

In the area of protection of flora and fauna, what is considered necessary to cull kangaroos on forest reserves?

I thought that would have been a wonderful dorothy dix question to come during Question Time, but when we are trying to find out who is responsible for the initiatives taken and for the losses so far through the Government's mismanagement of Satco and its various subsidiaries, one would have thought we could get a little more support from those people who may one day take over the role of a Minister on the front bench.

However, two questions stood out, and they were two examples of how things can go wrong. The first one came from that famous member for Briggs, that man who props up the Premier with all this good news information, that

member who has had no financial experience whatsoever. I am told that he once issued a financial report—minus the back page—many years ago which somehow, he claimed at that stage, gave him some financial genius. However, because of the total lack of financial expertise on the Government's front bench, the member for Briggs is being asked to do all the prop up jobs. It is the good news Premier who says, 'Don't tell them any of the facts: just keep feeding out the good news stuff and the public may be conned by it.' Anyhow, this good news 'propper upper' of the Premier, with a State budget of some \$4 000 million, has not as yet had one financial input into this Parliament, but comes forward the whole time with dorothy dix questions. The Premier stands up and says, 'Don't worry, it is all right.' However, all of a sudden the wheels are falling off the deal. The public is starting to ask questions. It wants to know where all the funds are going and who is responsible. The Premier has to go back and ask the member for Briggs, 'What can I say next?'

I will go through briefly what we had in this Estimates Committee farce. The member for Briggs rushes in and sits down with his little bit of paper. The Minister is sitting at his desk all poised and ready. All of a sudden, at 9.30 p.m., a couple of the press rush in and sit in their cubby holes. In Canberra they are called the Rat Pack, but I can assure members that they do not have that ability over here. I think they are more the mousepack. Anyway, they are up there, and everyone is poised at 9.30 for this great statement. The member for Briggs is sitting there, ready; the Minister is ready. We had our questions ready, but we did not get them answered as we were fobbed off. Mickey Mouse is up there ready to write it down, and away goes the member for Briggs with the headlines for tomorrow. Here we are, all ready, and Mickey Mouse has probably interrupted his evening cinema to come back and get the news for tomorrow. Here we go with the question: 'Will the Government and the police consider introducing another firearms amnesty this season because of the problem with unlicensed and illegal firearms in the community? Many concerns have been raised in my electorate.' Mickey Mouse is writing flat out for tomorrow's headline. The member for Briggs is writing on, getting it all down, thinking that it is magnificent. The Minister shuffles around underneath his books and pulls out his prepared statement and starts to read from it.

The Hon. Jennifer Cashmore interjecting:

Mr D.S. BAKER: Yes, the statement prepared by the member for Briggs, and I thank the member for Coles for that. He starts reading and, as he reads on (and Mickey Mouse up there started to write a bit faster), he says, 'Yes, I can indicate that there is a decision and that it is part of a longstanding agreement between the Police Commissioners around the country for a national firearms amnesty to be held from 1 October to 31 December 1988.' The member for Briggs looked; the Minister stopped and said that there must be a mistake—it was supposed to be 1987.

Mickey Mouse stopped writing; everything stopped; tomorrow's headline was gone absolutely; and that was the contribution of the member for Briggs to that evening's entertainment. Mickey Mouse went off; the member for Briggs sidled out and we carried on until 10 p.m. asking the pertinent questions and being fobbed off expertly by the Minister.

The House will never guess that tomorrow's headline did not make it. It was all wrong. It was all teed up, it was the wrong list of paper with the wrong year, yet we had to sit through this. Day after day we sat through the setup. It happens in Question Time also. Everyone looks up there,

in Mickey Mouse land; they look down, and when the member for Briggs looks up at them away they go. I do not blame the member for Briggs, because they are all his mates, but they would not get away with it in Canberra, because it would not be tolerated. We should have a higher standard of journalism in this State. There might even be some investigative journalists who really want to know what is going on behind this good news Government.

I am sure that with the calibre of some of the Rat Pack—as they are known in Canberra—people would not put up with this nonsense when every time Question Time starts 15 people run in with good news for the day and preparing it all for them. Those journalists might go out and read the Auditor-General's Report or some of the reports on how highly the citizens of this State are being taxed. We might get investigative journalism instead of this Mickey Mouse nonsense that goes on. Another matter that caught my eye in the Estimates Committees was that, after sitting for a long period trying to find out where the money that the State had invested in Satco—the \$37 million—had gone, listening hour after hour in what we thought were seven or eight hours of questioning, we thought the State's taxpayers would be pleased if we could somehow ascertain where mistakes were made and, most importantly, who made them.

But no, instead we have this fob off for the whole time. Suddenly, when we were desperately trying to ask more questions and the Minister was desperate not to reply, one poor member of the Committee got his lines mixed up and within 1½ hours he asked the same question twice. That was brought to his notice and I made reference to it in loud and vociferous terms, but *Hansard* somehow deleted that interjection. Unfortunately, the lines were messed up and that was a problem that we encountered in the Estimates Committees, which are used for dorothea dix questions from Government members when they should not have been used in that way. What is going on and where the money is being spent in this State is a matter of serious concern, but when the system is being propped by dorothea dix questions from the Government side, while we have press people in this State who hang around with their mate the member for Briggs and cannot get off their bottoms to start delving into the financial affairs of this State, the public in South Australia are being conned with this good news event.

The wheel is falling off the deal, as the Auditor-General has said, and as we go through his report the community will understand that things are not what they should be. If we can get some members of the press to go outside Parliament House and look at what is going on with ASER, Satco and the *Island Seaway* (which it is said will sail around the island, because of steering problems, if it ever gets over there), they will see that these people, without any financial expertise whatsoever, are trying to run this State, covering up that they do not have the expertise; and the only way that they can do this is by taxing the citizens at a greater and greater level.

That is not what the Estimates Committees are all about. They should be used by the Government to tone up its performance, and by the press to start finding out exactly what is going on and not to sit around and be handed dribble by the member for Briggs, as he tries to prop up the poor old Premier who really does not know the credit side from the debit side.

I will now deal with a couple of short items in the Auditor-General's Report and in the Estimates Committees. There is a greater sniff about the *Island Seaway* deal than about 10 tonnes of oysters left on the wharf for three weeks in summer. Things are not all that they should be with the

Island Seaway. During the Estimates Committees we asked, 'Why was there such a rush?' and 'Why were tenders not called?' The answers came thick and fast—that there was no need to call tenders; that there was advice from some wonderful person who knew all about this; and that there was a consultants report. I asked whether the consultants report, as to why we should not call tenders could be tabled. The answer was that that could not be done because it could be of some commercial significance.

However, it came out in some of the replies, and is common knowledge, that Eglo was going to get it at any rate, because it had to be seen to be doing something so that we could get the submarine contract. I do not criticise that at all. All I want is for the Minister and the Government to come clean and say that they did not let a contract because they wanted Eglo to have the deal, that they will show us what the deal was, and that they had a consultants report which said that it was okay and that it was to the benefit of the State. But they are hiding it.

We then asked what happened to the three pages of problems, and that was promptly fudged off. Most importantly, we asked what the savings were by going this fast track. Members opposite would not know what the fast track is, but it is used a lot in the building and engineering areas and means that a builder can design and build as he goes; and if that occurs, he must have very firm subcontracting prices so that the cost does not escalate.

We then asked what the Minister thought the fast track had cost. The answer was that the fast track had hardly cost any time and that it had not cost much money—but that is not what the Auditor-General says. In the end we were told that it cost about three months—to build the biggest ship ever built in South Australia without tenders.

It is very interesting to note that the Auditor-General states that a contract was let 'without going to tender'. It is very unusual for a Government to spend what was to have been only \$15.5 million, but it has already escalated to \$19.3 million without going through the tender process. The Auditor-General notes the areas in which those increases of \$3.8 million have occurred. He specifically mentions the rise and fall. If you get into the fast track, there are problems with the rise and fall, especially if the contract is to be kept on schedule. He further mentions contract variations, which is a common fault with all building and engineering quotes and contracts because, once you get into the fast track, you cannot control contract variations. Foreign exchange variations amount to over \$500 000. The Auditor-General frowns on that fact a little, but then he mentions the reimbursement of costs incurred by a company due to late receipt of drawings.

When you are competent, this fast track may be okay, but it certainly costs this Government some money. Apart from all that, the Minister admitted that only three months was saved. The *Island Seaway* was due to be completed in May, but it will not be completed until December, so the fast track did not save us three months; the vessel cost us \$3.8 million extra, and it will be completed approximately seven months late. As I mentioned, it is rumoured that at least it bears to the right because of steering problems (and I totally agree with that) but, if it is going to reach Kangaroo Island, they have to point it well out to sea. It is an indictment on the Government when it spends \$19 million of taxpayers' money and decides to go to the fast track, when it did not save any time at all, as it has admitted and as has been proven. So, if the Government had come clean and said, 'Okay, we really want Eglo to do the job and this is what we built into it', that would have been much better.

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE (Coles): Earlier this evening the member for Hanson told us that today is the tenth anniversary of his service on the Public Accounts Committee. I take this opportunity to pay a tribute to the member for Hanson for his service on that committee. I think it has been of an outstanding order of merit for a member of this Parliament. During the past 10 years he has earned the reputation of being absolutely single minded in the pursuit of public accountability for public expenditure. During that time I know that he has created fear in and perhaps incurred the wrath of various Ministers on both sides of the House. He has probably made many a public servant tremble, but he has certainly reinforced in the minds of all South Australians the power of this Parliament, and indeed any Parliament, when it comes to rigorous scrutiny of public expenditure on behalf of the taxpayers who finance that expenditure.

I say without hesitation that the member for Hanson has had such a high profile that he has been responsible for giving the Public Accounts Committee much of the status that it now holds in the eyes of the community. In fact, I well recall that in the first two years of the member for Hanson's service on the Public Accounts Committee when he was a member of the Opposition, and a subsequent three years when he was Chairman of the committee as a member of Government, the committee was rarely referred to by the simple title 'Public Accounts Committee': it was invariably known and referred to by the press as 'the powerful Public Accounts Committee'. Since the member for Hanson has no longer been Chairman, the profile of that committee has diminished more than somewhat.

Mr Oswald interjecting:

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE: As my colleague the member for Morphet said, it has more or less had its teeth drawn by the present Administration, but the member for Hanson is still in there fighting, as evidenced by the number of questions that he places on notice as a private member of Parliament and the vigour with which he pursues his role as a member of the Public Accounts Committee. I think it is appropriate that a tribute is placed on the record on this the tenth anniversary of the member for Hanson's appointment to the Public Accounts Committee.

The Estimates Committees have now concluded and, having served on five of them, I will make some observations about not only the Committees themselves but the actual preparation and presentation of the program performance papers. Having been part of the parliamentary examination of program performance budgeting for several years now it is my impression that this year's presentation was not of the standard of previous years. I found that the presentation of the aims, objectives and goals of the various departments was truncated by comparison with previous years. It was difficult to relate this year's programs to last year's programs and this year's goals to last year's goals because they appeared to vary considerably and there was not always a reference in this year's targets to what was achieved last year. In other words, I think that Parliament's task was made considerably more difficult by changes which were not for the better in the presentation of the program performance papers.

I also believe that Ministers, when responding to Opposition inquiries, failed to pick up the continuing thread which was evident at least on the Committees on which I served as to the relationship between the input of taxpayers' money and the outcome in terms of the benefit for taxpayers by way of implementation of Government policy. Until we can ensure that these Committees are used to measure inputs and the consequent outcomes in terms of public

benefit, I feel that we will not put into effect the purpose for which the Estimates Committees were established.

I served on the Estimates Committees for Environment and Planning, Tourism, Health, Education and Community Welfare. With the exception of the Minister of Health, whose performance has already been remarked on for its prolixity and the Minister's filibustering when replying, the other Ministers I believe made genuine attempts to provide information. However, I was concerned that, while four of the Ministers were quite relaxed and obviously felt secure in having their departmental advisers answer questions of a highly specific nature requiring highly specific and closely informed responses, the Minister of Tourism, for some reason which is not apparent, seemed extraordinarily reluctant to let her officers make any responses at all, even when the questions were not of a Party political nature and required simple factual answers.

I thought it was most unusual that the Director of Tourism was not permitted to answer any questions, even in his capacity of Chairman of the Adelaide Convention Bureau Board. I put questions which really could have been answered only by the Chairman and properly should have been answered only by him. Clearly, the Minister was incapable of answering those questions and she even seemed to be incapable of listening to what the Chairman of the board was trying to tell her and then passing it on to the Committee. The result was very unsatisfactory. What we have on the record from the Hon. Barbara Wiese is a series of extremely vague and evasive replies to a set of important questions.

I refer particularly to the question I asked about the mechanisms which the Adelaide Convention Centre Board is using to ensure that deficit funding is accurately forecast and kept under rigid control. That question was raised in the Auditor-General's Report and is clearly a question that the Government wants satisfactorily answered. However, by way of reply the Minister of Tourism was able merely to say that she had set up a board to administer the centre. Everybody knows that; any child in the street or any reasonably well informed person could tell you that. That was not the information that was being sought.

The Minister seemed to be incapable of coming to terms with a question that was highly relevant to this budget in relation to the deficit funding that the Convention Centre will attract, namely, a figure in the order of \$3.7 million. The fact that the Director of the department was not permitted to answer questions and that only two questions in the several hours of questioning were referred to departmental officers reflects poorly on the Minister's capacity to use her departmental officers for the benefit of Parliament during the budget Estimates Committees and is an indication that she feels somehow insecure and bound to attempt to demonstrate whatever knowledge she has by trying to deal with all issues on her own. That was not the case in relation to Environment and Planning, nor was it the case in relation to Education and Community Welfare, where Ministers quite freely referred questions to their departmental officers and when the replies, in the main, were very useful and well informed.

The Adelaide Convention Centre expenditure by way of deficit funding, which is identified in the budget estimates as \$3.6 million, already appears to have expanded to \$3.7 million, judging by the Minister's answers to questions in the Estimates Committee. The Minister appeared to dismiss the increase as being of no account, but the fact is that \$100 000 is a substantial sum, and there are certainly people in the tourism industry who would like to have \$100 000, if it can be spared by the Government, spent on the pro-

motion of attractions which would lead to increased patronage throughout the State.

A question regarding the Convention Centre deficit funding for the next year and the ensuing two years, which had to be placed on notice in the Estimates Committee, has brought forth the following answer:

The projection of deficit funding for the next three years is as follows:

| | |
|---------|----------------|
| 1988-89 | \$3.66 million |
| 1989-90 | \$3.95 million |
| 1990-91 | \$4.26 million |

The Minister indicated in the Estimates Committee that increases would be likely to be restricted to CPI increases. The Opposition certainly hopes that is the case because, if it is not, the South Australian taxpayer will be up for an increasing burden. I would be very surprised if that is not the case. We will be examining most closely the deficit funding provided for next year. If it is more than \$3.66 million, the Opposition will certainly want to know the reason why.

I have the feeling that it may be more than the projected figure when I look at the answer to another question about Convention Centre projected bookings. The Minister provided me with a table which represents actual bookings made together with the forecast of total number of bookings for the next three years. For 1988-89 there are 52 proposed bookings covering 180 days use of the centre, but it does not say how much space in the centre is required. As a result, the revenue from those bookings is not necessarily the maximum.

There are 189 forecast bookings for 300 days. We are close to 1988-89 and, as such bookings are invariably made well ahead of time, we seem to be way behind our goal if it is 189 bookings for 300 days. At this stage we have only 52 bookings for 180 days, so there is an awful lot of leeway to be made up. Needless to say, the situation looks worse (on paper at any rate) for 1989-90, when there are 22 bookings for a total of 96 days and the forecast is 195 bookings for a total of 310 days. In 1990-91, there are 12 bookings for a total of 69 days (again no space indications are given), and 205 bookings for 315 days is the forecast.

As international conventions have at least a five year lead time, and national conventions a three year lead time, and that organisers of conventions want to ensure that bookings are secured within that lead time, I would say that the marketing of the Adelaide Convention Centre needs to be considerably stepped if we are not to be paying rather more substantial funds by way of deficit funding. I hope for the sake of the State and the tourism industry, in particular the convention industry, that I am wrong, but to me these bookings put us in a vulnerable position.

One of the further interesting things to come out of the tourism Estimates Committee was the confirmation by the Minister of the steady, persistent annual reduction in marketing funds to intrastate and interstate promotions of South Australian tourism. The Minister attempts to cover this reduction by saying that the department hopes to make it up by way of cooperative advertising. In other words, the Government spends a dollar or two and the private sector spends a dollar or two, so the total figure of promotion of destinations in South Australia is boosted by that private expenditure. However, I make the point that, whilst it is a laudable goal and one that I support to attract private expenditure and match it with Government expenditure, when our competitors in other States are spending so much more than we are in the first place the Government cannot step back two or three paces and say that it will reduce its contribution and expect the private sector to increase its contribution.

The vast majority of tourism operators in South Australia are small businesses. Many are not in a position in these difficult times to make a big contribution by way of marketing and promotion funds. Certainly in some of the regions—Kangaroo Island would be a notable example—the industry looks to the Government to stimulate some kind of increased visitation by the reasonable expenditure of funds. Certainly the industry does not expect a year by year reduction in marketing funds, as has happened over the past three years under the present Minister and her predecessor.

In the Environment and Planning estimates one of the interesting things to emerge was the department's recognition of the unsatisfactory manner in which supplementary development plans had been dealt with over recent years and the enunciation of a somewhat harder line policy that will place much more responsibility on local councils and relieve the department of much of the work that it is currently doing in rewriting plans.

The most important thing, in my opinion, that was contained in a statement by the Director-General of the department, Dr McPhail, was his statement, 'We have been preparing in parallel'—that is, in parallel with the new policy—a series of what will be ministerial documents setting out clear guidelines for the preparation of SDPs. That has been sorely needed for a very long time, and I think it is an indictment of the Minister that it has taken so long for it to happen. The Director-General goes on to say:

Incidentally, guidelines have existed for a long time, but many council planning consultants have been prepared to ignore those guidelines.

For goodness sake! If consultants are ignoring guidelines it is well within the Minister's power to make sure that they observe those guidelines, and if this whole charade of everlasting frustrations and delays which have been allowed to occur and which have imposed tremendous costs on local government and on developers could have been avoided by the promulgation of a clear set of ministerial guidelines which were upheld at the Minister's insistence, why was it not done months if not years ago? That is a question which should certainly be posed.

I could not let this response to the Estimates Committee pass without drawing attention yet again to the fact that the funding for the maintenance of national parks is completely inadequate. The Government has very little hope of arresting the degradation that has occurred over recent years in South Australia's national parks unless it is prepared to put more resources into those parks. The work of volunteers in assisting the parks is of remarkable quality, and I pay tribute to all those who work in that capacity. But no amount of volunteer input can possibly compensate for the very great needs existing in this area.

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

Mr OSWALD (Morphett): The member for Coles commenced her contribution by referring to the Public Accounts Committee and the 10 years served on that committee by the member for Hanson. The member for Hanson joined the Public Accounts Committee in 1977 and served an apprenticeship there from 1977 to 1979, and when the Tonkin Government assumed the Treasury benches in this State the honourable member became Chairman of that committee. I was fortunate enough to also be appointed to that committee from 1979 and served on it for six years. Those were a very interesting six years, because three years were spent in Government and three years in Opposition.

It has been interesting, without repeating the comments made by the member for Coles in praise of the work put into the PAC by the member for Hanson, to stand back now that two or three years has elapsed since I was on that committee, and compare the type of work it undertook during the chairmanship of the member for Hanson between 1979 and 1982 with the type of work it has undertaken since the present Chairman took over in 1982, together with the present members of the committee. From 1979 to 1982 the committee undertook what we would call investigative accounting: it undertook efficiency auditing; it encouraged efficiency auditing in departments; it went out into Government departments seeking evidence of excessive expenditure of public funds; and it generally earned the title of the powerful Public Accounts Committee. There is no way that the present PAC has earned the right to be called a powerful committee. It is now a soft option which is sitting there looking at the Public Service.

The Government, through the Premier and Cabinet, has effectively muzzled the Public Accounts Committee. It no longer gets involved in anything that would cause the slightest ripple to the Government. It no longer gets involved in investigative accounting, and it no longer has a Chairman who is prepared to rock the boat in his own Party room. It is no longer an effective watchdog. All the committee is involved in now is the long, drawn out and year-long investigations into assets and the like. I suppose that there is nothing wrong with the type of investigation it undertakes into the assets of the State and the cost of replacing deteriorating assets, but that has now become the all-consuming subject of reports that we receive from that committee.

If the Government is no longer prepared to put up with further charges from me over the forthcoming months and years that the Public Accounts Committee in South Australia has been detoothed and that it has become a lame duck, I suggest that the Public Accounts Committee should change its tack and get on with what it is supposed to be doing, that is, effectively investigating financial expenditure in this State, so that taxpayers know that at least there is a watchdog committee looking into public expenditure. That is not happening at the moment, and the present members of the committee know it is not happening. I ask the committee to silence me by producing reports which at least indicate that it is looking into financial matters of the Government. Let us hear from the committee.

Members interjecting:

Mr OSWALD: Opposition members on the committee do not have the power to initiate subjects for investigation: we know that. Members opposite cannot snore me. They interject, but I spent six years on the committee and I know what it is like to have a majority—and I know what it is like to be in a minority on that committee—and this applies to a lot of these parliamentary committees. Let the Parliament just take on board that the Public Accounts Committee has been detoothed by the Government.

Mr Hamilton interjecting:

Mr OSWALD: The member opposite who is defending the committee is a member of it; however, I submit that he is defending the indefensible. One cannot deny that reports coming out of the PAC are designed not to cause the slightest ripple. If I might remind members of the history of this, it goes back to the time of the hospitals report which the Labor Government brought in and which brought about the demise, in the long term, of the Labor Government back in 1978-79. It started to put the skids under the Labor Government. Ever since then, all Labor Chairmen of the Public Accounts Committee have been instructed that never again will a report of that magnitude,

capable of causing such damage to the Labor Party, ever see the light of day. In summary, all I can say is that during the time of the Liberal Administration from 1979 to 1982 the committee, under Chairman Becker, earned its right to be a powerful Public Accounts Committee. Opposition members in this Parliament are very disappointed at where it is going at this time.

I now refer to the Estimates Committees, and I want to make some opening remarks about the conduct of the committees. Once again, the Government raised most of the sensitive revenue raising issues before the budget was actually brought down. This has been done in the past and it is now tending to become a tactic of the Government. In looking at the revenue measures that the Government raised before the budget was introduced in the House and the measures that were introduced when the budget was introduced, we find that the revenue collection of the South Australian Labor Government has moved faster than inflation. That was not the case interstate, and I think it is interesting to note here that the State Labor Government is contributing to inflation.

Mr Hamilton interjecting:

Mr OSWALD: If the honourable member does not like what I am saying, perhaps he might make a contribution. It is interesting to note that not one Government member has chosen to take part in this debate. We have put up 14 speakers on this side to talk about the budget and the Estimates Committees, but not one Government member has thought enough of this debate to get up and support the Treasurer.

There has been a hike in the petrol tax and the distribution of the proceeds has shifted; they should be devoted to main roads but will now go into general revenue. Public transport fares have risen, as have Housing Trust rents and motor registration fees. On 10 June last year the Premier said that he would link all rises to the CPI. From time to time the Premier comes out with these throw-aways to get the press off his back. What happened? Absolutely nothing. The commitment was never kept. The Government went ahead and increased its tax gathering revenue and charges in excess of the CPI. Tax collections in this State have increased by 11.3 per cent, which is an increase in real terms of 4 per cent.

The Estimates Committees, which were introduced by the Tonkin Government, were designed for a specific purpose, that is, to enable members from both sides of the House, particularly members of the Opposition, to obtain financial information from Ministers and their advisers. I have no doubt that dozens of public servants who came in here during those two weeks collectively put in hundreds, maybe even thousands, of man hours into preparation of the estimates and answers to questions that might be asked. When we found that Government members had prepared 'dorothy dix' questions to which the Ministers gave long answers to make sure that the Opposition could not get information, it was an abuse of the parliamentary process. In addition, it was an insult to the intelligence of every public servant who put in hundreds of hours of preparation. They had to sit back while the Ministers put on an act. I do not believe that, in their own mind, there is one member of this Chamber who would disagree with me.

As an example, I will cite the Minister of Health. He gave his usual 15 or 20-minute reply which, if one understood the question and knew what he was talking about, one knew was verbal diarrhoea. When he finished that reply he turned to his departmental officers and asked them to expand further. That is a deliberate attempt by the Government to ensure that members on this side are prohibited from asking

questions of a financial nature, as they are obliged to ask; the Government is insulting the intelligence of every member and public servant who came into this place. On one occasion in my role as Whip as I sat here preparing for the afternoon session I noticed that a public servant sat at a table, pulled out a bundle of papers and said, 'These, Minister, are your questions.' I will not embarrass that public servant by naming him this year, but next year I will. What he did indicates clearly that the Minister had been given by that public servant questions that had been distributed to the back bench that he was to be asked that day. Members can smile, but they know that what I am saying is true.

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! Members are becoming unruly.

Mr OSWALD: It is interesting to consider the number of questions asked and answered during the Estimates Committees. Between 11 a.m. and 10 p.m. the Minister of Health was asked and answered only 84 questions and the Minister of Housing 128 questions. On the other hand, the Attorney-General answered 199 questions, over double the number answered by the Minister of Health. There is no reason why the Minister of Health, if he was fair dinkum, could not have increased the number of questions answered by at least 50 per cent. If the Government wants the Opposition to have some respect for it as an open Government then it should instruct its Ministers to be open in their replies and to not be smart alecs, like some Ministers, as this only insults the intelligence of the public servants who have spent hundreds of hours in the preparation of these documents. It does not insult our intelligence, because we know the arrogance of some Ministers. Ministers owe it to their Public Service staff to do a better job.

I turn now to a matter that was of particular interest to me during the Estimates Committees when I asked the Minister of Transport a question in the following terms: if you have sold off the north-south corridor between Darlington and Anzac Highway, if there is this enormous housing development and increase in the number of persons living in the southern region, and if the traffic on the South Road has now reached the volume level per day that it carried before the opening of Ocean Boulevard, what long-term plans has the Government made to cope with this traffic travelling on Brighton Road, Morphett Road, Marion Road and South Road? That was a simple, straightforward question requiring a simple, straightforward answer. This is a matter of great concern to people in the southern region. Three pages of questions later we got the answer that we thought would come, that the only plan the Government has is to set up a strategic planning committee consisting of three officers who will consult with local government and community organisations. I seek leave to continue my remarks later.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

ADJOURNMENT

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

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON (Heysen): I take this opportunity to come clean on a couple of matters—I believe that it is time for a true confession, which relates to the fact that for some time I have been on the ALP mailing list. I have been prepared to accept the correspondence that I have been given, but I have been a little worried about the last piece of correspondence, so I believe it is time that I

let the House know what I have been involved in over recent times. Yesterday I received a letter signed by Mr Bob McMullan, the National Secretary of the Third Term Fund, John Curtin House, Canberra.

Mr Meier interjecting:

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: It is impressive. The letter-head looks like that of a very expensive club, beautifully done, the ultimate of direct mailing. It is addressed to D. Wotton, c/o Parliament House, North Adelaide, 5006. It is dated 23 September 1987, and states:

Dear Mr Wotton.

This is my last letter to you on behalf of the Third Term Fund. I want to thank you for your contributions during the last three years. You have been a part of the historic victory, and your contributions to the Third Term Fund were a crucial part of that victory.

As you know, we used the Third Term Fund to finance our special new campaign for the marginal seats. We used the Third Term Fund for professional organisers, for the kind of technology needed to win marginal seats, and for advertising specific to those seats. This approach paid off handsomely.

And then the crunch line:

We couldn't have done it without you.

That worried me a little. I want to put on the record that I have never helped the Labor Party financially. I would hate one of my constituents to just pick this up off the floor somewhere or other and want to know what it is all about. I declare that I have never paid a cent to the Australian Labor Party. It has never been my intention to do so and it will never be my intention to do so. The mere fact that I received a letter from Mr McMullan thanking me sincerely for my support and saying that they could not have won the election without my help does little to flatter me, I can assure you. He goes on to say:

However, this historic win was not bought cheaply. Now that the final figures are in—

and this bit is underlined in black—

I can confirm that we are left with heavy post-campaign debts.

Obviously, the Minister of Labour told us all about this at the conference. I do not think he won any friends among his colleagues at the time. I think they were pretty upset. It was pretty obvious that the Premier was upset with what Mr Blevins was talking about, but anyway, we know that they are very heavily in debt and here we have the fact underlined, 'I can now confirm that we are left with heavy post-campaign debts.' Well, gosh, we cannot help but feel sorry for the little fellows on the other side and all of the problems that they have. Mr McMullan, the National Secretary of the Third Term Fund, John Curtin House, Canberra, went on to say:

That's why I need to ask you once again for campaign contributions. The campaign for the 1990 election has already begun. We have called our marginal seat MPs together and are putting together a strategy aimed at holding those marginal seats at the next election.

Well, bully for them, but they do not have Buckley's chance. He further stated:

Good preparation served us well for this election, we must do even more for the next.

I am afraid that I must tell Mr McMullan that he will do it without my assistance. He stated that it takes money to get over all the financial debts and financial concerns. He wrote:

That takes money. The ALP has always relied upon ordinary Australians—

and I suppose that is why he is writing to me—

for its financial backing, and we are asking again for your help. I reiterate I have never taken the opportunity to assist the ALP financially, and I wish to put that on the record. The letter continued:

For every \$50 we can extend our computer-based campaign one step further.

The mind boggles about what they are likely to do with the \$50 that I might have been prepared to give them. The letter further states:

Thank you again for your support and for sharing in this unprecedented Labor victory. I hope that you will, again, be able to contribute to what we believe is a most vital cause.

It really gave me a thrill to read that last bit, to think that they felt that I had something to do with the unprecedented Labor Party victory. It was interesting to hear Mr Cameron yesterday on radio talk about the likely move by the Prime Minister, Mr Hawke, to leave that office and seek greener pastures in about 18 months. It was also interesting to hear Mr Cameron say that he would do that because there is no way that the Labor Party under Bob Hawke would win another term at the next Federal election. Someone is wrong somewhere or other, but anyway they are all excited about the fact that I am supposed to have helped them, to have carried them through the last election with my financial support. The interesting thing is that at the end of all of this in what has been made to look like genuine handwriting, the letter states:

P.S. To pay for 1987 and start planning for 1990 we need your support now!

I have been wondering what sort of support I can offer the ALP. If any ALP candidates would like to back me in any financial way, I would have to consider it at the time. I am most impressed with the letter. I suggest that it is one of the best examples of direct mailing that I have seen. I do not know how much it cost to put it out, but one has only to look at the exclusive club-like letterhead at the top with blue colourings and the heading 'ALP Third Term Fund'. I would be happy to make a copy of this letter available to any of my colleagues on the other side of the House. I am sure that their contribution would be gratefully received. I reiterate that I regret to inform the ALP that I will not be offering any support for the next election.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: What concerns me more than anything else is that, because I have now stated my position, because I have come clean and indicated that I have been receiving ALP mail for some time, I suppose that I will be taken off the mailing list. That is of concern, because I felt all along that I was part of the show, that I was being involved in the running of the Government; that I was getting all these letters in glowing terms congratulating me on my part in the effectiveness of the Government at both the State and Federal level.

I will probably now be taken off the mailing list. If the member for Gilles could do anything about glossing over the fact that I will not contribute to the ALP financially but would be keen to continue to remain on the mailing list, I would appreciate that because it is good for both sides of the House, on this bipartisan matter, to be informed of what is happening in the ALP, and to be aware of all the financial difficulties it has and the fact that it is looking for funds. I regret that, notwithstanding this magnificent letter that I have received from the Third Term Fund, John Curtin House, Canberra, I will be unable to assist the ALP financially for the next Federal or State election.

Mr DUGAN (Adelaide): I am glad that the opportunity exists, while the Minister of Housing is in the Chamber, to return to one of the themes that I have raised consistently in a number of addresses to this House in both grievance debates and on other occasions, and that is the need for a greater variety of housing types and the development of housing opportunities in inner city areas.

Material that has undoubtedly been sent to every member by the Australian Bureau of Statistics provides an overview of the 1986 population census in respect of each member's electorate, and I will refer particularly to the Adelaide electorate. By doing this I wish to draw to the attention of the House the variety of dwelling types that currently exist in the electorate of Adelaide and to use those statistics to argue the case for an extension of that variety within the electorate.

The figures from the Australian Bureau of Statistics 1986 census indicate that within the electorate of Adelaide nearly 50 per cent of occupied private dwellings were separate houses or semi-detached houses, but perhaps the more important figure is that nearly one-third of the houses are what are generally described as medium density housing, and this figure of about one-third coincides with the number of people who are living in households of either one or two persons. Those particular types of households are, by and large, on the private and public rental market, for which I believe that there needs to be more support in the inner city area. I argue this for two reasons: first, claims that are made in my electorate office by people wishing to live in the inner city areas and the demand they make for inner city accommodation, particularly of a one or two person nature; secondly, the more general and philosophical reason related to a better utilisation of land in the inner city area.

Returning to the first reason, I will indicate to the House a number of cases that are currently before me as a result of requests made by constituents. The first case concerns a mother with two young children who left a violent husband and a violent domestic relationship of some years standing and went into a shelter in the electorate. As most members would know, the length of accommodation in a shelter is short term and administrators of shelters try to move these families into a more positive environment in a more settled area. However, the houses into which these people are moved are available only for a period of some three to six months, and it is hoped that then they will be able to move into longer-term accommodation, usually in the public housing sector.

This woman and her two young children have been in those circumstances now for some six months and it is necessary for her to start looking to move out of this half-way house into more permanent accommodation to allow other people moving through the shelter to come into that half-way house. It is expected to be somewhere between three and six months before she is able to obtain other accommodation. The particular difficulty that she faces is that the children have now been settled down a little better in schools within the Adelaide electorate and obviously she wants to maintain continuity for her children in the inner city area.

The second case relates to an elderly but recently married couple who live in damp and unhygienic rental accommodation. They want something small in a central area. Because of their financial and economic circumstances, the only housing that will be available to them is public rental accommodation. Because they have no added income and they do not have a car, they wish to be in the inner city area. Their wait is expected to be about 12 months or so.

The third case involves a young woman who has been living with her parents but who is suffering from the very unfortunate complaint of obsessive compulsive neurosis, which in her case involves cleanliness. It is becoming a particular strain on her parents to have her continuing to live in the same domestic arrangements. Even though there is a lot of emotional support for her, it is important that she obtain a place of her own where she can feel comfortable

and where she will be reasonably secure. She will have to wait about 12 to 15 months for public housing in the city.

The fourth case involves a woman who has lived in a larger home and who has had five children, all of whom have now left her, and she wants to move into a smaller place, again in the city, in order to be close to town and its facilities. These are just four cases of hundreds that have come to my electorate office relating to people who have had some public and, in some cases, private rental in the inner city area. Although the private rental has been subsidised by the Housing Trust, they have occupied different forms of housing for different reasons and different circumstances. The common element amongst them all is that they are on low or very limited incomes and they wish to continue to live in the inner city area.

The 1986 Bureau of Statistics census figures indicate that there has been a substantial increase in the number of what are generally described as medium density accommodation units both on the private and the public rental market in Adelaide and the inner city areas but the demand for this accommodation exceeds the supply.

The Government wants to move to a more flexible housing system which would enable people to live closer to their work and the facilities provided by the inner city and to move away from a dependence on a single housing type of accommodation. Further, the Government's aim to provide accommodation for these various groups of people at a lower relative cost I think will fulfil a number of urban planning objectives as well as a number of important social and economic objectives. It will ensure that at least those people who are involved in the housing examples I have cited will be able to utilise the facilities of the inner city and that will save the Government a considerable amount of money which is associated with the development of housing for them in the outer suburbs.

Mr GUNN (Eyre): I want to add to what the member for Morphett said about the Public Accounts Committee. I was appointed to that committee at the same time as was the member for Hanson. I recall the effort that went into the compilation of the report into the Health Department and the hospitals in this State. I recall also the reaction at a subsequent meeting when that report was tabled. At that time the committee comprised the Chairman (the member for Florey), Mr George Whitten and Mr Jack Olson. Unfortunately Mr Jack Olson was unceremoniously dumped from the next committee and the member for Todd took his place. We locked horns in the first five minutes, because it was quite evident that he had been instructed before he arrived that he was to make sure that the committee did not produce any more reports that were damaging to the Government. I believe that he has carried on along that merry way every since.

Poor old Mr Olson performed to the best of his ability, worked hard and tried to be fair, but he was dumped. Mr Whitten lost all chance of becoming a Minister, even though we believed that he was next on the rung. He was made a member of the committee to make sure that everything went as it should and nothing got out. However, he failed and that was the finish of him; and he was made the Chairman of the committee. So we should bring things up to date. The honourable member was correct. The present Chairman made it very clear at that time that he and not the then Chairman would run the committee, that no more embarrassing information would be released, and that the Opposition would be brought right into line and its involvement limited.

The second matter that I will address relates to the unfortunate fact that whenever there is an incident involving

firearms there is an emotional outburst from people whose knowledge of firearms is limited and who fail to understand that, if you bring in strict and tight rules and laws concerning the ownership of firearms, the only people who will have ready access to them are criminals. People should clearly understand that the overwhelming majority of people who own firearms are responsible and law abiding citizens who prize and highly value their firearms. These people either belong to sporting clubs such as gun clubs, rifle clubs or field and game clubs, or they are involved in agriculture and need firearms to help with pest control. Of course, there are also gun collectors.

When there is an unfortunate incident there is an emotional outburst from people who do not understand. I think it is unfortunate that we are creating a situation where the public really believe that, if these laws are tightened up, criminals will no longer have access to firearms and will therefore stop holding up banks, so that people will not be shot. However, this still occurs in countries which have strict firearm laws because there are illegal firearms. It is very difficult to obtain a handgun today in this society, but it is very easy for those with criminal intent to obtain a firearm; you can even obtain a bagful if you put up the money.

Mr Hamilton interjecting:

Mr GUNN: If the honourable member does not know, he is pretty dull. In fact, he has demonstrated on a number of occasions that he is rather naive. Not far from the area he represents there is a fair chance that one could obtain a handgun; in fact, you could get more than one. If the honourable member talks to some of his colleagues, I am sure that they will tell him about that. Any person with any engineering knowledge could easily make a firearm if they had the criminal intent. The Government should look at increasing the penalties for the misuse of firearms and should not try to prevent law abiding people from going about their business. The Government should increase the penalties and deal with the criminals.

When my Party was in government we were told that if a marvellous computer system was brought in it would be the answer to the maiden's prayer. Of course, that has not been the case and it never will be. In New Zealand the Police Department recommended to the Government that it should abolish registration of firearms because it was an absolute waste of taxpayers' money and police resources could be better spent in other areas; as a result, registration was abolished. The inspector in charge of firearm control in New Zealand said that the situation reached a ridiculous stage, and in fact even Sir Keith Holyoake, who had been dead for two years, nearly received a renewal. He had a wellknown name, and it was a sheer fluke that they managed to pull out the renewal. That clearly demonstrates the futility of the registration system. If you make a sensible licensing system too restrictive, people will obtain firearms illegally. People in agriculture need them. They need shotguns—

Mr Plunkett interjecting:

Mr GUNN: The honourable member from time to time prides himself on having some knowledge of agriculture and some knowledge of pastoral areas. I think he has ably demonstrated tonight that he must have been in a dream world in those shearing sheds. Perhaps he got woolly blight or sandy blight.

Mr Plunkett: What are you going to shoot—mosquitoes?

Mr GUNN: The honourable member obviously needs a cold shower to bring himself back to reality, because these are the facts. I do not know whether the honourable member has ever heard of foxes.

Mr Plunkett interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! There will be no interjections across the floor. I ask the honourable member to address the Chair.

Mr GUNN: I am only too pleased to do so. I will try to enlighten the honourable member, as difficult a task as it may be. I do not know whether he has ever heard of shooting foxes and dingoes. I do not know whether the honourable member has ever attempted to shoot them. He may be good with a handful of wheat on the backside of a bull. That might be as close as he can get. Birds such as galahs and parrots have to be destroyed and shotguns are the only way to do that. People have to shoot rabbits. They get permits to shoot various types of kangaroos. They also have to destroy stock.

Mr Plunkett: How often have you done that?

Mr GUNN: Quite often. I have shot sheep. The honourable member would know it is the most humane way of disposing of such animals. Last Friday night I shot a number of rabbits with a shotgun. I suppose I would have fired a dozen shots. I had armed myself with a high powered rifle to shoot foxes because we get dozens of them.

Mr Plunkett: You shouldn't be shooting them.

Mr GUNN: The honourable member wants his head examined. That sort of dense mentality which has been displayed by the honourable member on this occasion clearly

indicates the need to educate the community and the need for commonsense to apply. Many of the honourable member's constituents would be involved in the South Australian Gun Club, clay target shooting, the Field and Game Society and pistol shooting. Thousands of people enjoy that kind of productive activity every weekend. The sorts of restricted programs which the Hon. Don Hopgood has been talking about, will simply impede these law abiding citizens from going about their lawful business.

I hope that commonsense will prevail and that penalties for illegal use will increase. If people hold up banks you can put them in gaol and leave them there for a while, but do not go interfering with the majority of people who have never committed an offence in their life and are unlikely to do so. It is obvious that the honourable member has never walked through a shearing shed or he has got sandy blight because people do and will continue to use firearms. I appeal to the Minister and those people in the police force who advise him to look at the matter in a reasonable fashion and not to allow this emotive argument to blind their judgment because commonsense should prevail at the end of the day.

Motion carried.

At 10.29 p.m. the House adjourned until Wednesday 7 October at 2 p.m.

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday 6 October 1987

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

CENTRAL WESTERN PROJECT TEAM

1. **Mr OLSEN** (on notice) asked the Minister of Education, representing the Minister of Community Welfare:

1. Is it Government policy to allow the type of competition with small businesses resulting from services advertised by the Central Western Project Team of the Department for Community Welfare in the print media which compete directly with the private sector using cost advantages as a result of being a Government body such as employees who are paid by the taxpayer and not having to pay sales tax?

2. What happens to the funds generated from the activities undertaken by the project team which has advertised in the marine section such services as boat and trailer repairs, boat seats, clearance of ski boats, outboard services and catamaran hire?

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: The replies are as follows:

1. The Central Western Project Team is part of the department's state wide program for serious offenders, difficult adolescents and youths seen as at risk of offending.

More specifically, the project centre's boat building program caters for Aboriginal youth who might otherwise be in detention (or at risk of offending) as well as being unemployed.

Historically, Aboriginal youth have been consistently over-represented in secure care populations and various attempts to provide traditional young offender programs have not enjoyed anywhere near the same success as the boat building project. On average, Aboriginal youth are staying in this program for nine months rather than dropping out after a few weeks, as had often been the case.

The project provides opportunities to learn new work and social skills, to develop greater self-esteem and, ultimately, to be far more confident and competitive in the labour market.

Apart from its success within the framework of departmental services to young offenders, the program enjoys a very high standing within the general Aboriginal community, the CES (who provide funding) and the South Australian Police Force.

Recently, for example, the South Australian Police Liaison Unit specifically invited three youths from the project to participate in a task force examining the problems of Aboriginal youth in Hindley Street.

In summary then, the boat building project has been a most successful venture into addressing the needs of Aboriginal young offenders through the development of a range of new work skills and experiences.

Any concerns that there may have been regarding competition from the central western project team were addressed and resolved satisfactorily approximately two weeks ago when the Small Boat Building Association (SBBA) invited the supervisor of the project team to their annual meeting. In fact the SBBA were successful in encouraging the project team to join their association. It is clear that the involvement of the project team in the industry is most positive in a number of respects.

Over the past three years initiatives undertaken by the project team have injected approximately \$250 000 into industry. In addition it has enabled many prospective employers to take advantage of trained youth who are more readily equipped and able to work immediately within the

industry. This year alone, seven young people have gained full-time employment in the industry because of the skills learned in the project team.

Regarding the specific reference to taxation, whilst the team is sales tax exempt, in calculating the cost of the final product, staff at the team add on the appropriate sales tax and an additional 10 per cent profit margin prior to sale.

2. The funds generated (i.e. from boat building, rental and repairs) are paid back into Department for Community Welfare revenue, which in turn is used to maintain the self-sufficiency of the program.

DISCIPLINARY LETTERS

7. **Mr GUNN** (on notice) asked the Minister of Forests: How many requests has the AWU made to the Minister to withdraw disciplinary letters to employees of the Woods and Forests Department and how many officers of the department have had to withdraw notices and apologise for reprimanding AWU members?

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

A) two,

B) nil.

NOISE CONTROL

20. **Mr OLSEN** (on notice) asked the Minister for Environment and Planning:

1. Did the Minister grant an exemption from the application of section 10 of the Noise Control Act to C.P. Engineering to carry on industrial activity on a site in Fisher Street, Salisbury formerly occupied by Hexagon Engineering Pty Ltd and, if so, when was that exemption applied for, when was it granted and upon what conditions?

2. When was an application from a Mr A. Coventry for a similar exemption made and for what reasons was it refused?

3. When was an application from Hexagon Engineering Pty Ltd for Government assistance to relocate its activities from Fisher Street, Salisbury to a site at Angle Vale Crescent, Bolivar made and why was it rejected?

4. Has the Government offered assistance to C.P. Engineering to relocate activities from Fisher Street, Salisbury to Angle Vale Crescent, Bolivar and, if so, when was such assistance first applied for, when was it approved and what is the nature of the assistance to be provided?

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

1. Yes. The application was received on 15 July 1987 and was granted on 21 July 1987 subject to the following conditions:

(a) This exemption shall come into force at 7 a.m. on 27 July 1987 and shall expire at 5 p.m. on 1 August 1987.

(b) Within this period, noise from the premises shall not be audible on any other property after 5 p.m. or before 7 a.m. on any day.

2. No application has been received from a Mr A. Coventry.

3. Hexagon lodged an application for assistance to relocate dated 2 September 1986 due to problems with the noise level and zoning regulations. The assistance level approved for the anticipated expansion was not drawn upon due to the company being placed into receivership.

4. The Government has not offered assistance to C.P. Engineering to relocate activities from Fisher Street, Salisbury to Angle Vale Crescent, Bolivar.

ANNUAL REPORTS

30. **Mr OLSEN** (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport, representing the Minister of Health: In relation to the report of the Institute of Medical and Veterinary Science, 1985-86—

1. (a) how many copies were printed;
 - (b) how many were distributed to State Government departments, agencies or authorities;
 - (c) how many copies have not yet been distributed; and
 - (d) what was the total cost of production including photography, writing, typesetting, design and printing?
2. If the report was printed by the Government Printer, were quotations for the work first sought from commercial printers and, if so, what were those quotations and, if not, why not?

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: The replies are as follows:

1. (a) 2 650
 - (b) 155
 - (c) approximately 600—reports are still being distributed.
 - (d) The cost of typesetting and printing was \$23 177.29. The cost of photography, writing and design is not readily available as these services are provided in-house by staff members as part of their normal duties.
2. As the report is a parliamentary paper it is practice for it to be printed by the Government Printer. No formal quotes were sought from commercial printers.

34. **Mr OLSEN** (on notice) asked the Minister of Education: In relation to the report of the Director-General of Education, 1985—

1. (a) how many copies were printed;
 - (b) how many were distributed to State Government departments, agencies or authorities;
 - (c) how many copies have not yet been distributed; and
 - (d) what was the total cost of production including photography, writing, typesetting, design and printing?
2. If the report was printed by the Government Printer, were quotations for the work first sought from commercial printers and, if so, what were those quotations and, if not, why not?

The Hon. G.J. CRAFT: The replies are as follows:

1. (a) 2 000
 - (b) 1 670.
 - (c) none.
 - (d) \$16 303.82. As is customary, typesetting and some pre-press costs were paid for by the State Parliament.
2. No quotations were sought from commercial printers because the Government Printer is the sole authority for the procurement of printing for all Government departments.

GOVERNMENT VEHICLES

39. **Mr OLSEN** (on notice) asked the Deputy Premier: How many officers in the following departments have a 'permanent' or 'regular' allocation of a Government vehicle for travel between home and the office under the criteria detailed in Circular No. 30 dated 16 June 1987 from the Commissioner for Public Employment:

Department of Environment and Planning;
Auditor-General's Department;

Police Department;
South Australian Metropolitan Fire Service; and
Engineering and Water Supply Department?

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: The reply is as follows:

| | |
|---|-----|
| Department of Environment and Planning: | 56 |
| Auditor-General's Department: | 1 |
| Police Department: | 120 |
| South Australian Metropolitan Fire Service: | 21 |
| Engineering and Water Supply Department: | 284 |

43. **Mr OLSEN** (on notice) asked the Minister of State Development and Technology: How many officers in the following departments have a 'permanent' or 'regular' allocation of a Government vehicle for travel between home and the office under the criteria detailed in Circular No. 30 dated 16 June 1987 from the Commissioner for Public Employment:

Department of State Development;
Office of the Ministry of Technology;
Department of Technical and Further Education; and
Office of Employment and Training?

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: The reply is as follows:

| Department of State Development and Technology | | |
|--|-----------------|------------|
| Name | Title | Allocation |
| J. Duncan | Deputy Director | Permanent |
| Centre for Manufacturing | | |
| Name | Title | Allocation |
| J. Cambridge | C.E.O | Permanent |

The above does not include officers belonging to agencies or corporations which administer their own funds i.e. Technology Park Adelaide Corporation, Industrial Supplies Office, Riverland Development Council, Manufacturing Advisory Council and Small Business Corporation.

| Department of TAFE | | |
|--------------------|--|------------|
| Name | Title | Allocation |
| L. Fricker | D.G | Permanent |
| F. Ebbeck | Director, O.T.E. | Permanent |
| V. Ager | Executive Officer, TAFE/Ed. Co-operation Project | Permanent |
| P. Ellyard | Executive Assistant Special Projects | Permanent |

Office for Technology

The Office of the Ministry of Technology was amalgamated with the Department of State Development effective 16 March 1987. Prior to the amalgamation one permanent government vehicle was allocated to the office for use by the then Director of the Ministry of Technology. No permanent Government vehicle is currently allocated to the Office for Technology within the Department of State Development.

| Office of Employment and Training | | |
|-----------------------------------|----------------------------|------------|
| Name | Title | Allocation |
| G. Edwards | Director | Permanent |
| G. Saundry | A/Senior Youth-worker | Regular |
| F. Kinnear | A/Senior Youth-worker | Regular |
| T. Sanders | Senior Training Supervisor | Permanent |
| R. Banks | Senior Training Supervisor | Permanent |
| J. Sullivan | Senior Training Supervisor | Permanent |
| D. Bury | Training Supervisor | Permanent |

Office of Employment and Training.

| Name | Title | Allocation |
|----------------|---------------------|------------|
| B. Langley | Training Supervisor | Permanent |
| R. Divine | Training Supervisor | Permanent |
| R. Coombe | Training Supervisor | Permanent |
| R. Bridgewater | Training Supervisor | Permanent |
| R. Martin | Training Supervisor | Permanent |
| R. Mildrum | Training Supervisor | Permanent |
| C. Thompson | Training Supervisor | Permanent |
| G. Holloway | Training Supervisor | Permanent |
| C. Bradley | Training Supervisor | Permanent |
| B. Hanna | Training Supervisor | Permanent |

44. **Mr OLSEN** (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport: How many officers in the following departments have a 'permanent' or 'regular' allocation of a Government vehicle for travel between home and the office under the criteria detailed in Circular No. 30 dated 16 June 1987 from the Commissioner for Public Employment:

Department of Transport;
Highways Department;
State Transport Authority; and
Department of Services and Supply?

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: The reply is as follows:

| | |
|-----------------------------------|-----|
| Department of Transport | 9 |
| Highways Department | 210 |
| State Transport Authority | 21 |
| Department of Services and Supply | 8 |

NEW SOUTHERN ROUTE

64. **Mr OLSEN** (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport: In relation to the promise by the Premier in a press statement on 15 August 1984 that the Government would build a major new road south of Adelaide to supplement South Road and Ocean Boulevard at a total cost of \$45 million:

- has design work for the project been completed by the Highways Department;
- has the road been scheduled in the department's future construction program and, if so, when will construction commence and when is it expected that the Sturt to Majors Roads and Majors Road to Reynella stages, respectively, be completed; and
- what now is the estimated cost of the project?

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: The replies are as follows:

- A planning investigation by the Highways Department has enabled the third arterial road corridor alignment to be determined between Marion Road, Darlington, and Reynella. No design work has been undertaken.
- No. On 1 September 1987, I announced that construction will not proceed before 1993. However, the situation will be reviewed annually.
- The estimated cost of the third arterial road is between \$60 million and \$70 million (1987 prices).

DRIVER INTERVENTION PROGRAM

81. **Mr OLSEN** (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport: In relation to the announcement by the Premier on 29 August 1984 that the Government would introduce a driver intervention program to retrain drivers 'who are most at risk':

- when did this program begin; and

- how many drivers have so far been required to participate in it?

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: In August 1984, State Cabinet approved a package of road safety measures, one of which was the introduction of a driver improvement program. A project was undertaken to determine the feasibility of such a program. The objects of the project were to:

- Construct a driver information file containing both offence and accident records.
- Investigate the relationship between driving offences and the likelihood of accident involvement.
- Analyse the driver information file to identify high risk groups and recommend intervention strategies for these high risk groups.

A number of problems were encountered which need to be rectified before any intervention strategies can be introduced. The main problems related to matching up accident information with driver licence information (more than 40 per cent of accident records could not be matched with a driver) and to the huge computing costs associated with accessing large files on the Government Computing Centre's equipment. These problems should, in part, be overcome when the Road Safety Division is operating on its own computing equipment, the purchase of which the Government has approved. However, the project did find that drivers' offences are related to accidents, indicating that the current demerit points scheme is targeting accident risk drivers.

Officers from both the Motor Registration Division and Road Safety Division are looking at ways to overcome problems with matching driver licence offence records and accident reports. When these problems have been resolved and the Road Safety Division's computing equipment becomes operable, investigations can continue into the feasibility of introducing a driver improvement program.

STAFFING LEVELS

86. **Mr OLSEN** (on notice) asked the Premier: How many officers were employed at 30 June 1984, 1985, 1986 and 1987 under the Public Service Act or the Government Management and Employment Act and, at each date, how many officers were employed in each of the following departments, in the classifications—(a) Executive Officer; (b) Administrative Officer; and (c) Clerical Officer:

Department of the Premier and Cabinet;
Department of the Public Service Board;
Treasury Department;
Department for the Arts?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The numbers of officers employed at 30 June 1984, 1985 and 1986 under the Public Service Act in individual departments and statutory authorities are listed in the Public Service Board annual reports for those years. The figures for 1987 will be contained in the 1986-87 annual report of the Commissioner for Public Employment. This report will be tabled in the current session of Parliament. The Leader has also asked for additional statistics on the numbers of these officers in each department who were in the Executive Officer, Administrative Officer and Clerical Officer classifications at 30 June 1984, 1985, 1986 and 1987. This information is not readily available in the form that the Leader is requesting. Past reports of the Public Service Board do not include statistics in this format. However, they do contain information on classifications of officers by gender for all Public Service Act staff in departments. The annual report of the Commissioner for

Public Employment for 1986-87 will include statistics on classifications of officers by agency at June 1987.

87. **Mr OLSEN** (on notice) asked the Deputy Premier: How many officers were employed at 30 June 1984, 1985, 1986 and 1987 under the Public Service Act or the Government Management and Employment Act and, at each date, how many officers were employed in each of the following departments in the classifications—(a) Executive Officer; (b) Administrative Officer and (c) Clerical Officer:

Department of Environment and Planning;
Auditor General's Department;
Police Department;
South Australian Metropolitan Fire Service;
Engineering and Water Supply Department?

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: The number of officers employed at the 30 June 1984, 1985 and 1986 under the Public Service Act in individual departments and statutory authorities are listed in the Public Service Board annual reports for those years. The figures for 1987 will be contained in the 1986-87 annual report of the Commissioner for Public Employment. This report will be tabled in the current session of Parliament. The Leader has also asked for additional statistics on the number of these officers in each department who were in the Executive Officer, Administrative Officer and Clerical Officer classifications at 30 June 1984, 1985, 1986 and 1987. This information is not readily available in the form that the Leader is requesting. Past reports of the Public Service Board do not include statistics in this format. However, they do contain information on classifications of officers by gender for all Public Service Act Staff in departments. The annual report of the Commissioner for Public Employment for 1986-87 will include statistics on classifications of officers by agency at June 1987.

88. **Mr OLSEN** (on notice) asked the Minister of Education, representing the Attorney-General: How many officers were employed at 30 June 1984, 1985, 1986 and 1987 under the Public Service Act or the Government Management and Employment Act and, at each date, how many officers were employed in each of the following departments in the classifications—(a) Executive Officer; (b) Administrative Officer; and (c) Clerical Officer:

Attorney General's Department;
Court Services Department;
Electoral Department;
Department of Public and Consumer Affairs;
Department of the Corporate Affairs Commission?

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: The numbers of officers employed at 30 June 1984, 1985 and 1986 under the Public Service Act in individual departments and statutory authorities are listed in the Public Service Board annual reports for those years. The figures for 1987 will be contained in the 1986-87 annual report of the Commissioner for Public Employment. This report will be tabled in the current session of Parliament. The Leader has also asked for additional statistics on the number of these officers in each department, who were in the Executive Officer, Administrative Officer and Clerical Officer classifications at 30 June 1984, 1985, 1986 and 1987. This information is not readily available in the form that the Leader is requesting. Past reports of the Public Service Board do not include statistics in this format. However, they do contain information on classifications of officers by gender for all Public Service Act staff in departments. The annual report of the Commissioner for Public Employment for 1986-87 will include statistics on classifications of officers by agency at June 1987.

89. **Mr OLSEN** (on notice) asked the Minister of Lands: How many officers were employed at 30 June 1984, 1985,

1986 and 1987 under the Public Service Act or the Government Management and Employment Act and, at each date, how many officers were employed in each of the following departments in the classifications—(a) Executive Officer; (b) Administrative Officer; and (c) Clerical Officer;

Department of Lands;
Woods and Forests Department;
Department of Marine and Harbors.

The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT: The numbers of officers employed at 30 June 1984, 1985 and 1986 under the Public Service Act in individual departments and statutory authorities are listed in the Public Service Board annual reports for those years. The figures for 1987 will be contained in the 1986-87 annual report of the Commissioner for Public Employment. This report will be tabled in the current session of Parliament. The Leader has also asked for additional statistics on the number of these officers in each department, who were in the Executive Officer, Administrative Officer and Clerical Officer classifications at 30 June 1984, 1985, 1986 and 1987. This information is not readily available in the form that the Leader is requesting. Past reports of the Public Service Board do not include statistics in this format. However, they do contain information on classifications of officers by gender for all Public Service Act staff in departments. The annual report of the Commissioner for Public Employment for 1986-87 will include statistics on classifications of officers by agency at June 1987.

90. **Mr OLSEN** (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport, representing the Minister of Health: How many officers were employed at 30 June 1984, 1985, 1986 and 1987 under the Public Service Act or the Government Management and Employment Act and, at each date, how many officers were employed in each of the following departments in the classifications—(a) Executive Officer; (b) Administrative Officer; and (c) Clerical Officer:

South Australian Health Commission;
Department for Community Welfare?

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: The numbers of officers employed at 30 June 1984, 1985 and 1986 under the Public Service Act in individual departments and statutory authorities are listed in the Public Service Board Annual Reports for those years. The figures for 1987 will be contained in the 1986-87 Annual Report of the Commissioner for Public Employment. This report will be tabled in the current session of Parliament.

The Leader has also asked for additional statistics on the number of these officers in each department, who were in the Executive Officer, Administrative Officer and Clerical Officer classifications at 30 June 1984, 1985, 1986 and 1987. This information is not readily available in the form that the Leader is requesting. Past reports of the Public Service Board do not include statistics in this format. However, they do contain information on classifications of officers by gender for all Public Service Act staff in departments.

The Annual Report of the Commissioner for Public Employment for 1986-87 will include statistics on classifications of officers by agency at June 1987.

91. **Mr OLSEN** (on notice) asked the Minister of State Development: How many officers were employed at 30 June 1984, 1985, 1986 and 1987 under the Public Service Act or the Government Management and Employment Act and at each date, how many officers were employed in each of the following departments in the classifications—(a) Executive Officer; (b) Administrative Officer, and (c) Clerical Officer:

Department of State Development;
Office of the Ministry of Technology;
Department of Technical and Further Education;
Office of Employment and Training?

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: The numbers of officers employed at 30 June 1984, 1985 and 1986 under the Public Service Act in individual departments and statutory authorities are listed in the Public Service Board Annual Reports for those years. The figures for 1987 will be contained in the 1986-87 Annual Report of the Commissioner for Public Employment. This report will be tabled in the current session of Parliament.

The Leader has also asked for additional statistics on the number of these Officers in each Department, who were in the Executive Officer, Administrative Officer and Clerical Officer classifications at 30 June 1984, 1985, 1986 and 1987. This information is not readily available in the form that the Leader is requesting. Past reports of the Public Service Board do not include statistics in this format. However, they do contain information on classifications of Officers by gender for all Public Service Act Staff in Departments.

The Annual Report of the Commissioner for Public Employment for 1986-87 will include statistics on classifications of officers by agency at June 1987.

92. **Mr OLSEN** (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport: How many officers were employed at 30 June 1984, 1985, 1986 and 1987 under the Public Service Act or the Government Management and Employment Act and, at each date, how many officers were employed in each of the following departments in the classifications—(a) Executive Officer; (b) Administrative Officer; and (c) Clerical Officer:

- Department of Transport;
- Highways Department;
- State Transport Authority;
- Department of Services and Supply?

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: The numbers of officers employed at 30 June 1984, 1985 and 1986 under the Public Service Act in individual departments and statutory authorities are listed in the Public Service Board Annual Reports for those years. The figures for 1987 will be contained in the 1986-87 Annual Report of the Commissioner for Public Employment. This report will be tabled in the current session of Parliament.

The Leader has also asked for additional statistics on the numbers of these officers in each department, who were in the Executive Officer, Administrative Officer and Clerical Officer classifications at the 30 June 1984, 1985, 1986 and 1987. This information is not readily available in the form that the Leader is requesting. Past reports of the Public Service Board do not include statistics in this format. However, they do contain information on classifications of officers by gender for all Public Service Act staff in departments.

The Annual Report of the Commissioner for Public Employment for 1986-87 will include statistics on classifications of Officers by agency at June 1987.

93. **Mr OLSEN** (on notice) asked the Minister of Mines and Energy: How many officers were employed at 30 June 1984, 1985, 1986 and 1987 under the Public Service Act or the Government Management and Employment Act and, at each date, how many officers were employed in the Department of Mines and Energy in the following classifications:

- (a) Executive Officer;
- (b) Administrative Officer; and
- (c) Clerical Officer?

The Hon. R.G. PAYNE: The numbers of officers employed at 30 June 1984, 1985 and 1986 under the Public Service Act in individual departments and statutory authorities are listed in the Public Service Board Annual Reports for those years. The figures for 1987 will be contained in the 1986-87 Annual Report of the Commissioner for Public Employment.

This report will be tabled in the current session of Parliament.

The Leader has also asked for additional statistics on the numbers of these officers in each department, who were in the Executive Officer, Administrative Officer and Clerical Officer classifications at 30 June 1984, 1985, 1986 and 1987. This information is not readily available in the form that the leader is requesting. Past reports of the Public Service Board do not include statistics in this format. However, they do contain information on classifications of officers by gender for all Public Service Act staff in departments.

The Annual Report of the Commissioner for Public Employment for 1986-87 will include statistics on classifications of officers by agency at June 1987.

94. **Mr OLSEN** (on notice) asked the Minister of Education: How many officers were employed at 30 June 1984, 1985, 1986 and 1987 under the Public Service Act or the Government Management and Employment Act and, at each date, how many officers were employed in each of the following departments in the classifications (a) Executive Officer; (b) Administrative Officer; and (c) Clerical Officer:

- Education Department;
- Office of Aboriginal Affairs;
- Children's Services Office?

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: The numbers of officers employed at 30 June 1984, 1985 and 1986 under the Public Service Act in individual departments and statutory authorities are listed in the Public Service Board Annual Reports for those years. The figures for 1987 will be contained in the 1986-87 Annual Report of the Commissioner for Public Employment. This report will be tabled in the current session of Parliament.

The Leader has also asked for additional statistics on the numbers of these officers in each department, who were in the Executive Officer, Administrative Officer and Clerical Officer classifications at 30 June 1984, 1985, 1986 and 1987. This information is not readily available in the form that the leader is requesting. Past reports of the Public Service Board do not include statistics in this format. However, they do contain information on classifications of officers by gender for all Public Service Act staff in departments.

The Annual Report of the Commissioner for Public Employment for 1986-87 will include statistics on classifications of officers by agency at June 1987.

95. **Mr OLSEN** (on notice) asked the Minister of Housing and Construction: How many officers were employed at 30 June 1984, 1985, 1986 and 1987 under the Public Service Act or the Government Management and Employment Act and, at each date, how many officers were employed in the Department of Housing and Construction in the following classifications:

- (a) Executive Officer;
- (b) Administrative Officer; and
- (c) Clerical Officer?

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: The numbers of officers employed at 30 June 1984, 1985 and 1986 under the Public Service Act in individual departments and statutory authorities are listed in the Public Service Board Annual Reports for those years. The figures for 1987 will be contained in the 1986-87 Annual Report of the Commissioner for Public Employment. This report will be tabled in the current session of Parliament.

The Leader has also asked for additional statistics on the numbers of these officers in each department, who were in the Executive Officer, Administrative Officer and Clerical Officer classifications at 30 June 1984, 1985, 1986 and 1987. This information is not readily available in the form that the leader is requesting. Past reports of the Public Service

Board do not include statistics in this format. However, they do contain information on classifications of officers by gender for all Public Service Act staff in departments.

The Annual Report of the Commissioner for Public Employment for 1986-87 will include statistics on classification of officers by agency at June 1987.

96. **Mr OLSEN** (on notice) asked the Minister of Labour:

How many officers were employed at 30 June 1984, 1985, 1986 and 1987 under the Public Service Act or the Government Management and Employment Act and, at each date, how many officers were employed in each of the following departments in the classifications: (a) Executive Officer; (b) Administrative Officer; and (c) Clerical Officer:

Department of Labour;

Department of Personnel and Industrial Relations; and

Department of Correctional Services?

The Hon. R. K. ABBOTT: The numbers of officers employed at 30 June 1984, 1985 and 1986 under the Public Service Act in individual departments and statutory authorities are listed in the Public Service Board Annual Reports for those years. The figures for 1987 will be contained in the 1986-87 Annual Report of the Commissioner for Public Employment. This report will be tabled in the current session of Parliament.

The Leader has also asked for additional statistics on the numbers of these officers in each department, who were in the Executive Officer, Administrative Officer and Clerical Officer classifications at 30 June 1984, 1985, 1986 and 1987. This information is not readily available in the form the Leader is requesting. Past reports of the Public Service Board do not include statistics in this format. However, they do contain information on classifications of officers by gender for all Public Service Act staff in departments.

The Annual Report of the Commissioner for Public Employment for 1986-87 will include statistics on classifications of officers by agency at June 1987.

97. **Mr OLSEN** (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport, representing the Minister of Tourism: How many officers were employed at 30 June 1984, 1985, 1986 and 1987 under the Public Service Act or the Government Management and Employment Act and, at each date, how many officers were employed in each of the following departments in the classifications: (a) Executive Officer; (b) Administrative Officer; and (c) Clerical Officer:

Department of Tourism;

Department of Local Government?

The Hon. G. F. KENEALLY: The numbers of officers employed at 30 June 1984, 1985 and 1986 under the Public Service Act in individual departments and statutory authorities are listed in the Public Service Board Annual Reports for those years. The figures for 1987 will be contained in the 1986-87 Annual Report of the Commissioner for Public Employment. This report will be tabled in the current session of Parliament.

The Leader has also asked for additional statistics on the numbers of these officers in each department, who were in the Executive Officer, Administrative Officer and Clerical Officer classifications at 30 June 1984, 1985, 1986 and 1987. This information is not readily available in the form that the Leader is requesting. Past reports of the Public Service Board do not include statistics in this format. However, they do contain information on classifications of officers by gender for all Public Service Act staff in departments.

The Annual Report of the Commissioner for Public Employment for 1986-87 will include statistics on classifications of officers by agency at June 1987.

98. **Mr OLSEN** (on notice) asked the Minister of Agriculture: How many officers were employed at 30 June 1984,

1985, 1986 and 1987 under the Public Service Act or the Government Management and Employment Act and, at each date, how many officers were employed in each of the following departments in the classifications: (a) Executive Officer; (b) Administrative Officer; and (c) Clerical Officer:

Department of Agriculture;

Department of Fisheries; and

Department of Recreation and Sport?

The Hon. M. K. MAYES: The numbers of officers employed at 30 June 1984, 1985 and 1986 under the Public Service Act in individual departments and statutory authorities are listed in the Public Service Board Annual Reports for those years. The figures for 1987 will be contained in the 1986-87 Annual Report of the Commissioner for Public Employment. This report will be tabled in the current session of Parliament.

The Leader has also asked for additional statistics on the numbers of these officers in each department, who were in the Executive Officer, Administrative Officer and Clerical Officer classifications at 30 June 1984, 1985, 1986 and 1987. This information is not readily available in the form that the Leader is requesting. Past reports of the Public Service Board do not include statistics in this format. However, they do contain information on classifications of officers by gender for all Public Service Act staff in departments.

The Annual Report of the Commissioner for Public Employment for 1986-87 will include statistics on classifications of officers by agency at June 1987.

ASER

99. **Mr OLSEN** (on notice) asked the Premier: How much has it cost the Government to provide all access road, water, power, gas, sewer and other service connections to the ASER project site boundary in each of the years 1983-84 to 1986-87 and how much more is it expected these services will cost the Government?

The Hon. J. C. BANNON: Costs to the Government to provide services to the ASER project are as follows:

1. Access road—there are no special roadways required to enable construction works to be undertaken for the ASER site. Festival Drive has been sealed and will be resealed at the completion of the project. Those costs will be shared under the common areas agreement as 40 per cent Government and 60 per cent ASER Property Trust and will form part of the lease payment to that body.

2. Water and Sewerage (E & WS) 1985-86—\$21 986.

3. Power (E.T.S.A.) 1985-86—\$4 132, 1986-87—\$40 355.

4. Gas (S.A. Gas Company) 1985-86—\$200.

As all these services are now in place, it is not anticipated there will be further connection fees costs to be met by the Government.

STA

102. **Mr OLSEN** (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport: What costs did the STA incur for work on all the weekends and evenings when overtime, referred to in the 18 May issue of the official STA publication *Keeping Track*, was worked by staff involved in preparing rosters, schedules and timetables for the introduction of major service changes due to take effect from 28 June 1987 but which were rejected by the unions and how much of this work was wasted by the refusal of the unions to cooperate in the changes?

The Hon. G. F. KENEALLY: Overtime worked by staff to prepare timetables and rosters for the introduction of

major service changes due to take effect from 28 June 1987 amounted to \$18 300.

Little of this work will be used because problems arose in the interpretation of the Broomhill Roster Committee procedures which prevented the early implementation of its recommendations.

The STA anticipates that the Broomhill procedures will be ratified by the Arbitration Commission during September, and consequently the next practical date for the introduction of the new services will be May 1988.

SECURITY IN SCHOOLS

106. **Mr S.J. BAKER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Education:

1. What criteria are being used for the provision of:
 - (a) alarm systems in schools; and
 - (b) oversight by security guards of school premises?
2. During 1986-87, how many schools received regular visits from security firms and what was the average cost per school of this service?

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: The replies are as follows:

1. (a) The criteria include the number of incidents of break and entry/vandalism/theft; the cost to the Education Department for reimbursement of stolen/vandalised equipment; the cost of repair/maintenance to the Department of Housing and Construction; and the general crime rate in the school's locality.
- (b) As for (a) but to reflect the type of offence to be expected e.g. vandalism outside of buildings as distinct from break and enter.
2. Eighty-six schools received regular security patrols of twenty-seven visits per week to each school with an average cost per school of \$1 650.

MITCHAM GIRLS HIGH SCHOOL

107. **Mr S.J. BAKER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Education: Have any discussions been held or plans prepared for the resiting of Mitcham Girls High School?

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: In the report released in November 1986 regarding schools in the South West Corner of the Adelaide Metropolitan Area, one of the options discussed was the establishment of a girls school. Reference was made to the fact that Mitcham Girls High School had site limitations and relocation to a school in the South West Corner was a possibility.

Since that time, a committee has been established (the Newberry Committee) to consider future options for secondary facilities in the South West Corner. That committee is expected to report by the end of September 1987.

Apart from those discussions, the outcome of which cannot be anticipated, no other plans are held for the resiting of the school.

BUS AND TRAIN SERVICES

119. **Mr OLSEN** (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport:

1. What procedures are used by the STA to monitor the on-time running of its bus and train services?
2. From information obtained from such monitoring in each of the years 1985-86 and 1986-87, what proportion of those services operated—

- (a) within three minutes of the advertised schedule;
- (b) within five minutes of the advertised schedule; and
- (c) within ten minutes of the advertised schedule?

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: The replies are as follows:

1. *Buses:* Time recorder clocks at specific locations and Inspectorial Staff observations. However, the use of recorder clocks is restricted due to clearway operation and bus operator security during the hours of darkness.

Trains: The time of arrival at termini stations of all train movements is transmitted by the guard of the train, or station staff, to train control where it is recorded on a graph.

2. *Buses:* This data is not readily available without considerable research involving many person hours because each file would have to be analysed.

Trains: In accordance with train recording procedures:

- (a) for the years 1985-86 95.2 per cent of train services operated within three minutes of the advertised schedule.
In 1986-87 93.9 per cent of train services operated within three minutes of the advertised schedule.
- (b) Although the data to answer (a) above is readily available, such is not the case for (b) and (c).
- (c) Considerable manpower resources would have to be used to extract the necessary information from the records and this cannot be justified.

DEPARTMENTAL MARKET RESEARCH

135. **Mr OLSEN** (on notice) asked the Premier: Since the announcement on 1 May 1984 of criteria for the conduct of market research by Government departments and agencies, how many proposals for market research have been submitted to the State Statistical Priorities Committee, which departments or agencies submitted the proposals and what was the purpose and cost of each item of market research undertaken?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: Since the announcement on 1 May 1984, there have been 29 proposals for market research, submitted to the State Statistical Priorities Committee. The departments/agencies submitting the proposals, the purpose of the survey and the cost of the surveys are listed below.

| Department/ Agency | Purpose | Cost \$ |
|------------------------------|--|------------|
| Community Wel- fare | research in the general area of children | 9 000 |
| Mines and Energy | to evaluate the promotion and utilisation of the Energy Information Centre | 2 450 |
| | to survey public awareness of the Energy Information Centre | 2 400 |
| Environment and Planning | to assist in the provision of population projections for all non-metropolitan LGA's | 21 000 |
| | to survey community attitudes towards the State's heritage and heritage conservation matters | 2 050 |
| | to survey community attitudes towards the greening of Adelaide | 525 |
| | to survey knowledge and views on native vegetation clearance | 2 450 |
| | to survey the farming community | 3 000 |
| State Transport Authority | passenger survey on usage of: (i) periodical tickets (ii) system wide travel | 8 000 |
| | to survey public attitudes to and awareness of public transport and the STA | 15 000 |

| Department/ Agency | Purpose | Cost \$ | Special parties or large groups have been included in the above surveys. |
|--|---|------------|---|
| Local Government Department | survey was part of a project to increase the opportunities for all groups to participate in local government affairs and in particular to achieve an increase in voter turnout in the May 1985 election | 25 000 | <p>A boarding is made each time a passenger joins a vehicle while an alighting is made each time a passenger leaves a vehicle. The figures presented therefore indicate total passenger movements (boardings plus alightings) at each station. When a passenger makes a return journey to the city (from Adelaide for example) he or she will be counted twice in the Aldgate total; once boarding and once alighting. However, if a passenger makes a return journey between stations on the Bridgewater line (e.g. Bridgewater—Aldgate), he or she will be counted four times (a boarding and alighting at both stations). The figures presented will therefore overstate the real numbers of people using the services.</p> <p>In an endeavour to improve services between Belair and Bridgewater in 1979, the trains were re-scheduled to provide an 'off-peak' express service to Stirling hills residents. This strategy could not be extended to peak periods without the allocation of additional resources to the hills line. As can be seen from the above table, despite some promotion in the local press, the improved 'off-peak' service only attracted low levels of demand, the maximum load on these trains rarely exceeding the capacity of a bus.</p> <p>When the air conditioned 2000 class railcars entered service in 1980, one set was allocated to the Sunday afternoon Bridgewater train. Successive surveys in 1981 indicated maximum loads of 79, 112, 126 and 64 on these trains. Similar surveys in 1985-86 indicated maximum loads of 23, 53, 50 and 32, reflecting a significant reduction in demand despite the allocation of the State Transport Authority's best type of rollingstock to this service.</p> <p>Rail journeys on the Belair-Bridgewater train line have increased by only five percent over the last eight years at a time when population increased by over 60 percent. The public transport needs of the resident population during this time have been overwhelmingly met by State Transport Authority and private bus networks which together cater for 85-90 percent of all public transport trips. It would be difficult to envisage a major shift back to rail, given its travel time disadvantage and circuitous route to the city.</p> |
| Tourism | to survey intentions to holiday in South Australia | 8 750 | |
| | monthly surveys to measure the level and characteristics of day trip activity by residents of Adelaide | 8 000 | |
| | Grand Prix visitors survey | 15 000 | |
| | to survey South Australians, interstate and overseas visitors | 150 000 | |
| | to survey Perth Tourist Market relating to the awareness of the SA Travel Shop in Perth | 18 000 | |
| Health Commission | motivational research into smoking behaviour | 4 450 | |
| | to survey the perception of tar levels of cigarettes | 5 580 | |
| Transport | to survey motorist attitudes to red light cameras | 2 500 | |
| | evaluation of the Mr Hyde Road Safety Campaign | 9 000 | |
| | evaluation of increased penalties for drink driving offences | 6 000 | |
| | rural roadside survey of drink driving patterns, occupant restraint use and travel patterns | 125 000 | |
| | to survey attitudes to a graduated driver licensing system | 20 000 | |
| | to survey the knowledge attitudes and behaviour of parents to child restraint use | 5 000 | |
| Drug and Alcohol Services Council | to survey drug use and associated problems in Whyalla | 30 000 | |
| | to survey alcohol use amongst persons aged 12 to 23 | 20 000 | |
| Coast Protection Board | to survey beach users within the metropolitan Coast Protection District | 37 000 | |
| Engineering and Water Supply | to survey community attitudes on services provided by E&WS | 40 000 | |
| Transport Department (part funded by STA and Highways) | to survey travel behaviour in metropolitan area to be used for planning Adelaide's transport system | 260 000 | |

BRIDGEWATER RAIL SERVICE

140. **The Hon. D.C. WOTTON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport: What documentary evidence can be provided to support the STA saying that improving the Bridgewater rail service would not alter the patronage?

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: The number of people boarding and alighting on a weekday at stations between Belair and Bridgewater over the last 10 years is set out below:

| Boardings and Alightings at each Station National Park to Bridgewater 1978, 1982, 1984, 1986 and 1987. (One Day Surveys) | | | | | |
|--|------|------|------|------|------|
| | 1978 | 1982 | 1984 | 1986 | 1987 |
| National Park | 3 | 16 | 23 | 37 | — |
| Long Gully | 6 | 17 | 4 | 2 | — |
| Upper Sturt | 47 | 73 | 53 | 106 | 101 |
| Mount Lofty | 75 | 94 | 53 | 107 | 71 |
| Heathfield | 132 | 97 | 74 | 148 | 154 |
| Madurta | 25 | 5 | 20 | 17 | 14 |
| Aldgate | 100 | 54 | 52 | 88 | 69 |
| Jibilla | 8 | 19 | 19 | 41 | 33 |
| Carripook | 15 | 10 | 5 | 25 | 85 |
| Bridgewater | 302 | 206 | 225 | 290 | 220 |
| Total boardings and alightings | 713 | 591 | 528 | 861 | 747 |

MILLIPEDES

150. **The Hon. D.C. WOTTON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Agriculture: What stage has now been reached by Dr Bailey and the Department of Agriculture, respectively, as part of the program to eradicate millipedes and what plans does the Government have to continue this program in the next 12 months?

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: The State-funded project on control of the black Portuguese millipede is making excellent progress, both in terms of the work being done by Dr P. Bailey in Portugal and other research being done by Dr S. McKillup at the Northfield Research Laboratories.

Dr Bailey has succeeded in collecting large numbers of a Portuguese parasitic fly which attacks and kills the Portuguese millipede. Adults of the fly have been reared and Dr Bailey has also succeeded in setting up a breeding colony. Two shipments of flies have been sent by Dr Bailey to the Northfield Research Laboratories where they are being cultured under quarantine. Host-specificity testing, to establish whether the fly attacks Australian millipedes, is now being done. After this, an application will be made to release the fly in South Australia.

Studies by Dr McKillup at the Northfield Research Laboratories have identified a second possible way to control the black Portuguese millipede. For some years it has been

known that the number and nuisance caused by the black Portuguese millipede have decreased markedly in some areas of the Adelaide Hills where this pest was formerly in plague proportions. Experiments have isolated the cause of this decrease—a small Australian nematode. It is planned to rear this nematode in large numbers and to release it in areas where the Portuguese millipede is in plague proportions. A prototype light trap to reduce the number of millipedes entering houses has also been developed. This trap will be tested during the coming spring. If successful, its potential for commercial production will be investigated.

The honourable member used the word 'eradicate' in his question. I would like to take the opportunity to stress that it is most unlikely that the black Portuguese millipede will ever be eradicated from South Australia. A biological control program has the potential to reduce the numbers of a pest to a level which the nuisance, or damage caused, is greatly reduced. I am very happy to report that our research program looks extremely promising in terms of achieving this goal.

UNDERGROUND POWERLINES

151. **The Hon. D.C. WOTTON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Mines and Energy: What positive action had been taken by ETSA to implement recommendations proposed in the Lewis Report particularly as it relates to the undergrounding of powerlines in bushfire prone areas?

The Hon. R.G. PAYNE: The trust has adopted a policy of placing electricity mains underground in high bushfire risk areas provided the local community makes a group application including all who will be affected directly; gains council approval for the project; undertakes the cost of the trenching and reinstatement; undertakes the cost of alteration necessary to their own wiring.

The trust will supply and lay the cable and make the connections. I would point out that the trust is negotiating with landowners and the Mitcham council concerning a pilot undergrounding scheme at Winding Way, Belair. However, councils have generally indicated that they are unwilling to become involved in such schemes and there has been limited interest shown by community groups in taking up the trust's offer.

MAJOR CRIMES

155. **The Hon. B.C. EASTICK** (on notice) asked the Minister of Emergency Services: How many crimes were declared 'major crimes' in each of the report periods from 1980, what was the nature of each crime, which of them have been solved and what is the current status of investigations in each case not yet solved?

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: The reply is as follows:

| DECLARED MAJOR CRIMES | |
|---------------------------------|---------------|
| 1980-81 | |
| Number of Declared Major Crimes | 34 |
| Solved | 20 |
| Unsolved | 14 |
| <i>Nature of Crime</i> | <i>Number</i> |
| Murder | 6 |
| Robbery | 14 |
| Rape | 15 |
| Arson | 3 |
| Breaking on Premises | 8 |
| Missing Person | 1 |
| Suspicious Death | 1 |
| TOTAL | 48 |

N.B. Some declarations incorporate a number of crimes.

| 1981-82 | |
|---------------------------------|---------------|
| Number of Declared Major Crimes | 43 |
| Solved | 25 |
| Unsolved | 18 |
| <i>Nature of Crime</i> | <i>Number</i> |
| Murder | 11 |
| Attempted Murder | 2 |
| Suspicious Death | 3 |
| Skeletal Remains | 1 |
| Robbery | 10 |
| Larceny | 1 |
| Fire | 9 |
| Rape | 6 |
| Incest | 1 |
| Shop Break | 2 |
| Unlawful Acts | 1 |
| TOTAL | 47 |

N.B. Some declarations incorporate a number of crimes.

| 1982-83 | |
|---------------------------------|---------------|
| Number of Declared Major Crimes | 26 |
| Solved | 18 |
| Unsolved | 8 |
| <i>Nature of Crime</i> | <i>Number</i> |
| Murder | 10 |
| Attempted Murder | 2 |
| Suspected Poisoning | 1 |
| Robbery | 6 |
| Suspicious Death | 1 |
| Abduction | 2 |
| Arson | 2 |
| Suspicious Fire | 2 |
| Assault | 1 |
| TOTAL | 27 |

N.B. Some declarations incorporate a number of crimes.

| 1983-84 | |
|---------------------------------|---------------|
| Number of Declared Major Crimes | 27 |
| Solved | 19 |
| Unsolved | 8 |
| <i>Nature of Crime</i> | <i>Number</i> |
| Murder | 8 |
| Attempted Murder | 2 |
| Suspicious Death | 1 |
| Robbery | 17 |
| Burglary | 6 |
| Malicious Damage | 1 |
| Armed Siege | 1 |
| Escapee (Yatala) | 1 |
| TOTAL | 37 |

N.B. Some declarations incorporate a number of crimes.

| 1984-85 | |
|---------------------------------|---------------|
| Number of Declared Major Crimes | 29 |
| Solved | 23 |
| Unsolved | 6 |
| <i>Nature of Crime</i> | <i>Number</i> |
| Murder | 8 |
| Attempted Murder | 2 |
| Manslaughter | 1 |
| Suspicious Death | 3 |
| Robbery | 10 |
| Demand Money | 1 |
| Extortion | 2 |
| Create False Belief | 1 |
| Arson | 2 |
| TOTAL | 30 |

N.B. One declaration incorporates another crime.

| 1985-86 | |
|--|---------------|
| Number of Declared Major Crimes | 50 |
| Solved | 36 |
| Unsolved | 14 |
| <i>Nature of Crime</i> | <i>Number</i> |
| Murder | 14 |
| Attempted Murder | 2 |
| Suspicious Death | 5 |
| Shooting | 1 |
| Stabbing | 1 |
| Missing Persons | 4 |
| Robbery | 25 |
| Attempted Robbery | 1 |
| Demand Money | 3 |
| Extortion | 2 |
| Larceny | 1 |
| Arson | 1 |
| Suspicious Fire | 1 |
| Rape | 7 |
| TOTAL | 68 |
| N.B. Some declarations incorporate a number of crimes. | |

| 1986-87 | |
|---------------------------------|---------------|
| Number of Declared Major Crimes | 81 |
| Solved | 58 |
| Unsolved | 23 |
| <i>Nature of Crime</i> | <i>Number</i> |
| Murder | 9 |
| Suspicious Death | 3 |
| Robbery | 63 |
| Damage Building | 1 |
| Larceny | 1 |
| Arson/Extortion | 1 |
| Missing Person | 2 |
| Demand Money | 1 |
| TOTAL | 81 |

N.B. A declaration may include a series of crimes.
The case files on crimes that are unsolved still remain open.

QUESTION ON NOTICE NO. 179

156. **The Hon. B.C. EASTICK** (on notice) asked the Minister of Emergency Services: What are the reasons for delay in answering question on notice No. 179 from last session?

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: The information sought was not available by the time Parliament was prorogued. However, see answer to question on notice No. 155.

CAE POSTAGE AND TELEPHONE COSTS

159. **Mr BECKER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Employment and Further Education:

1. Has a review been undertaken to curtail costs of postage and telephone calls at each campus of the South Australian College of Advanced Education and, if so, what savings have been made or are anticipated?

2. Are all telephones at each campus international subscriber dialling and subscriber trunk dialling barred and, if not, why not?

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

1. The college has a policy of expending its postage funds on authorised mail, but in recent times it has been apparent that misuse of the mail system has occurred. The college is reviewing its practices to tighten the operation of the mail system. Specifically, random checks are being introduced and the assistance of senior managers has been sought to control unauthorised usage. This will be closely monitored to ensure compliance.

All college mail is forwarded from the various sites to Underdale for franking and delivery to a post office. The only exception is urgent mail which is posted from the sites. Hence a central control point exists for the majority of the college's mail. It is difficult to estimate the cost savings

resulting from the strengthening of internal control but approximately \$3 000 per annum is thought likely.

2. The telephone system was reviewed prior to the calling of tenders for a new PABX system. A new networking system has recently been installed. There have been some technical problems, but the college is working these out with Philips and Telecom. This system will allow internal dialling between sites by means of tielines and local call fees for these services will be avoided. The system will also enable the monitoring of the number of calls made from extensions at each site. The effects on expenditure will be closely monitored.

As a general rule all telephones are ISD and STD barred as is access to certain Telecom information services such as sports results. The Administrative Secretariat of the college considers submissions for ISD and/or STD access prior to approval being granted for these facilities on any extension.

The new system will provide ISD and STD access to the Principal, the Directors, Deans of Faculties, Head of External Studies and certain heads of units. Site Administrators, Course Coordinators, Field Experience Officers, the Industrial Relations Officer and some Heads of Schools will have STD access. Access is granted only if the staff member in question can show demonstrable, justifiable need for access.

STA BUILDING

161. **Mr OLSEN** (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport: What is the estimated completion cost of the new STA building on North Terrace?

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: The final cost of the building at 136 North Terrace, Adelaide will not be known for some time because there are disputes to be resolved regarding liquidated damages and claims for extension of contract time.

The South Australian Superannuation Fund Investment Trust and the South Australian Police Superannuation Fund have jointly invested \$27 million to own, by strata title, effectively floors 1 to 12, a portion of the ground floor and the construction of the underpass under North Terrace. The land under North Terrace is leased at a 'peppercorn' rental from the Corporation of the City of Adelaide. The State Transport Authority leases the areas covered by the strata titles owned by the South Australian Superannuation Fund Investment Trust and the South Australian Police Superannuation Fund. The basement and a major portion of the ground floor of the premises are owned by the Karidis Group and the value of the investment is unknown.

The rental that the State Transport Authority will receive for areas of the development that it will sublet as well as the income from the Adelaide Railway Station and environs will cover the cost of leasing from the South Australian Superannuation Fund Investment Trust and the South Australian Police Superannuation Fund. At the expiration of a 40 year term, the State Transport Authority will own the strata titles that it is leasing and will still own the Adelaide Railway Station and air rights. Any further questions regarding the project should be addressed to the owners, South Australian Superannuation Fund Investment Trust, South Australian Police Superannuation Fund and the Karidis Group.

STATE DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT CAMPAIGN

162. **Mr OLSEN** (on notice) asked the Minister of State Development and Technology: Following the statement by

the Premier reported in the *Advertiser* on 12 November 1984 that there had been more than 4 000 responses to a State Development Department campaign in July 1984 to encourage prospective investors to invest in South Australia, how many of those responses have subsequently led to decisions to invest in South Australia?

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: I advise that it is not possible to analyse each of the 4 000 responses to the campaign to encourage prospective investors to invest in South Australia, nor was there any intention to quantify each response. The Department of State Development's 1984 advertising campaign was designed to change attitudes towards South Australia in other Australian high population centres particularly Sydney and Melbourne. The strategy of the campaign was that, if favourable attitudes towards South Australia were attained, investors and entrepreneurs would be more likely to react favourably in considering South Australia in their investment plans.

The campaign was extremely successful in creating a positive general awareness of South Australia generating over \$1 million in additional publicity. According to Australian Bureau of Statistics data, private new capital expenditure in South Australia during 1984-85 totalled \$1.249 billion. It is not possible, however, to provide a quantitative estimate of the extent to which the advertising campaign contributed to investment during 1984-85. ABS data also indicates that, in the period July 1984 to March 1987, new private capital expenditure in South Australia amounted to \$3.616 billion.

SHOW DAY

169. **Mr BECKER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Education: Are school teachers and students granted a day off this year and in subsequent years to attend the Royal Adelaide Show and, if so, why and what is the estimated cost of the day off?

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: All Government schools in the State closed on one school day during the Royal Show period of 4 to 12 September 1987. The particular day chosen is determined at the school level with endorsement of the school council. Teachers do not have this day off. In addition, Government schools may close for a second day for an event of local significance as provided under Education regulations. Teachers are not required to be on duty when schools are closed for events of local significance. Once again, the school council is required to endorse this closure. The above provisions were determined arising out of negotiations over the introduction of the four-term school year when the Royal Agricultural and Horticultural Society expressed concern at the possible effect on attendance at the Royal Show consequent upon it being held during term time. There was no additional cost arising from these provisions, since the school closures were in lieu of closures which have occurred at other times in previous years.

SCHOOL ADVERTISING

170. **Mr BECKER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Education:

1. How many secondary schools in each region have advertised in local newspapers promoting their schools?
2. What was the cost of advertising and what was the source of funds?
3. Were these advertisements encouraged and approved by the Education Department and, if so, why?

4. What departmental policy or regulations govern such action?

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: The replies are as follows:

1. Adelaide area—four
Northern area—one
Southern area—two
Eastern area—nil
Western area—nil
2. Adelaide area—\$5 930. Source—school funds. Northern area—\$180. Source—Participation and Equity Program funding. Southern Area—\$4 031.20: Source—school funds.
3. No.
4. There is not a specific education regulation concerning advertising, but there is an implied policy contained in the publication 'Our Schools and their Purposes', which has been endorsed by the High School Principals Association, that schools shall not promote themselves by way of advertisement to the detriment of other schools. In addition to the above, schools do advertise open days, annual general meetings and year 7-8 induction days, but these are not of the promotional kind which seek to enhance enrolment draw.

PARTICIPATION AND EQUITY PROGRAM

171. **Mr BECKER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Education:

1. Where did funding for the Participation and Equity Program (PEP) come from for this calendar year?
2. Will funding be continued next year and, if not, why not?
3. What is the future of PEP?

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: The replies are as follows:

1. From the Commonwealth Schools Commission as a special purpose program.
2. No, because the program is to be terminated at the end of 1987.
3. 1987 is the Participation and Equity Program's final year.

GOVERNMENT MOTOR VEHICLE

181. **Mr BECKER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport:

1. To which Government department or agency has the motor vehicle UQJ 406 been assigned?
2. What Government business was the driver of the vehicle conducting on Wednesday 1 July at approximately 6.55 p.m. when it was sighted in the car park at the Oberdan Centre, Findon, and why were children in the vehicle at the time?

3. Who authorised the use of the vehicle on that day, and for what purpose, and if the vehicle was being misused according to the terms of authorisation what disciplinary action will be taken to ensure this incident does not recur?

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: The Motor Vehicle UQJ 406 is assigned to the Department of Agriculture. The officer's manager authorised use of the vehicle on the day in question to attend to official field business in the Mid North area. The journey involved early departure (7.15 a.m.) and late return (6.30 p.m.). On arriving home the officer was faced with a pressing family necessity which resulted in him using the vehicle for an unauthorised purpose.

In view of the officer's impeccable past record of strict adherence to Government regulations in the use of Government resources, a reprimand was regarded as the most

appropriate disciplinary action. The officer has been strongly reprimanded personally by the Chief Executive Officer and left in no doubt that any repetition will result in strong disciplinary action. A warning has also been issued to staff through their managers regarding unauthorised use of motor vehicles.

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION CIRCULAR

186. **Mr BECKER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Education: What is meant by the following paragraph contained in Circular C87/4 from the Acting Director-General of Education to principals of secondary schools:

Such an approach allows a continuation of a multi-agency approach to secondary education and at the same time allows for the development of specific policies which relate directly to the involvement of the Education Department in the evaluation of this group?

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: Such an approach will allow the Education Department to develop suitable programs for these young people, while at the same time working with other groups, like TAFE who could supplement secondary education for the age group.

WAKEFIELD PRESS ASSETS

197. **Mr OLSEN** (on notice) asked the Premier: In relation to each of the following assets of Wakefield Press sold to *The Adelaide Review*:

- (a) one second-hand IBM PC XT Personal Computer;
- (b) visual display unit; and
- (c) Epson Printer,

what was the original purchase price paid by Wakefield Press and what was the valuation of each at the time of its sale to *The Adelaide Review*?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The replies are as follows: The items listed, parts of the computer system of the Wakefield Press, cost and were valued as follows:

- (a) The IBM PC XT computer was purchased for \$3 132 and at time of sale was valued at \$2 173.
- (b) The visual display unit was purchased for \$228 and at time of sale was valued at \$158.
- (b) The Epson Printer was purchased for \$785 and at time of sale was valued at \$544.

BRIDGEWATER RAIL SERVICE

198. **The Hon. D.C. WOTTON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport:

1. What charges are levied by Australian National on STA's use of AN railway lines and facilities between Bridgewater and Keswick?
2. What charges are levied by STA on the AN's use of STA railway lines and facilities between Bridgewater and Keswick?
3. Prior to the closure of the Bridgewater rail service and the introduction of the limited service now in operation, were STA services required to fit in between scheduled AN services at peak hours and, if so, why?

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: The replies are as follows:

1. The State Transport Authority owns the section of line between Keswick and Belair and Australian National owns from Belair to Bridgewater.

Since the closure of the Bridgewater station, the only charge made to the STA by AN is for the use of the line. This charge is expressed as a rate per gross tonne kilometre (one tonne moved for one kilometre=one gross tonne kil-

ometre). Costs associated with the financial year 1986-87 were \$78 000.

2. The STA charges AN for the use of all metropolitan rail lines used by AN. Detailed information is not available from AN on a line by line basis and therefore the information required is unavailable.

3. Passenger trains have priority on metropolitan lines over AN trains with the exception of the Overland between Adelaide and Melbourne. The Overland's priority is necessary due to the inability to shunt it out of the way, due to its size, between Adelaide and Bridgewater.

MOUNT LOFTY RANGES

199. **The Hon. D.C. WOTTON** (on notice) asked the Minister for Environment and Planning:

1. What stage has been reached in the preparation of the Mount Lofty Ranges bushfire prone areas supplementary development plan?
2. Has there been consultation with representatives of all councils with responsibilities in such areas and if so, when and if not, why not?

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

1. The second Mount Lofty Ranges bushfire prone areas supplementary development plan has now been completed.
2. All affected councils were fully consulted on the first Mount Lofty Ranges bushfire prone areas supplementary development plan. The second supplementary development plan was forwarded to affected councils on 2 September 1987.

REGISTER OF STATE HERITAGE

200. **The Hon. D.C. WOTTON** (on notice) asked the Minister for Environment and Planning: Has the South Australian Heritage Committee dealt with recommendations contained in a report prepared by Danvers Architects, funded through the National Financial Assistance Program and completed in mid July 1985, which suggested that some 60 items in the District Council of Stirling area be considered for the Register of State Heritage and, if not, why not and, if so:

- (a) when were these recommendations considered; and
- (b) what action has been taken or is to be taken regarding these recommendations?

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: The reply is as follows: Yes.

- (a) December 1986.
- (b) 14 items are already listed on the Register of State Heritage Items; 20 items were recommended by a heritage subcommittee for listing as soon as possible; 15 items were queried, the committee stating they required further information or questions of policy to be solved before a decision could be reached; 16 items were considered not to be of State significance and were recommended for local protection only; and 2 items required further study, as a result of fire damage, seriously affecting their significance.

REPETITIVE STRAIN INJURY

202. **Mr BECKER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Housing and Construction:

1. How many House of Assembly members' electorate staff are now on workers compensation due to repetitive strain injury, at what electorate offices are they employed and what was the commencement date of compensation in each case?
2. How many electorate office staff have been on compensation for RSI since its official recognition by the Government?
3. How many and which electorate offices now have more than one full or part-time employee, for what reason in each case, what is the additional cost of these extra staff and for how much longer will such extra cost have to be met?

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: The replies are as follows:

1. Currently there are five House of Assembly members' electorate secretaries who are the subject of worker's compensation claims due to repetitive strain injury. At this time, all secretaries are on duty, although each person has had some time off in the past. The electorate offices concerned, together with commencement date of compensation in each case, are:

Albert Park, April 1985.

Playford, August 1985.

Bright, April 1987.

Walsh, July 1985.

Hayward, July 1985.

2. Only the five electorate secretaries mentioned above have been on compensation for RSI since its official recognition by Government.

3. A total of 16 electorate offices have more than one full or part-time employee. These offices, together with reasons for the additional staff, are set out below.

Ross Smith, Baudin, Norwood, Napier, Ramsay, Unley, Whyalla Stuart—Due to ministerial commitments, there is greater workload in these offices.

Eyre, Flinders, Murray-Mallee—Due to the size of these electorates, there is greater workload in these offices.

Albert Park, Playford, Bright, Walsh, Hayward—Due to RSI complaints experienced by the permanent electorate secretaries,

temporary extra assistance has been provided to ease the workload and assist in the recovery of the permanent staff.

The additional cost of this staff is \$233 694 per annum. All of the above positions are permanent, with the exception of Albert Park, Playford, Bright, Walsh and Hayward. Extra assistance for these offices, totalling \$53 800 per annum, would continue for an indefinite period pending further medical advice.

TERTIARY INSTITUTION MOTOR VEHICLES

205. **Mr DUIGAN** (on notice) asked the Minister of Employment and Further Education: In respect of the following institutions—

The University of Adelaide;

Flinders University of S.A.;

Roseworthy Agricultural College;

South Australia College of Advanced Education; and

South Australia Institute of Technology—

(a) how many motor vehicles are owned by those institutions;

(b) how many of those vehicles are clearly identifiable to members of the public as belonging to that institution;

(c) are any moves in train by those institutions to ensure that the remainder, if any, are identifiable as belonging to the institutions;

(d) are any of the vehicles permanently assigned to particular individuals and, if so, how many and to whom;

(e) what is the policy of each institution in respect of the use of such vehicles for private purposes;

(f) are the vehicles provided to individuals as a condition of their employment; and

(g) do any of the institutions pay fringe benefits tax in respect to any of the vehicles and, if so, what was the amount of that payment in 1986-87?

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

| | The University of Adelaide | The Flinders University of SA | Roseworthy Agric. College | SA College of Advanced Education | SA Institute of Technology |
|---|---|--|---|---|----------------------------|
| 1. How many motor vehicles are owned by your institution? | 94 as at 1 March 1987. | 29 of which 26 are operated from a Central Pool. | 27 of which 9 are used almost exclusively on College property | 49 generally all regarded as pool vehicles. | 22 |
| 2. (a) Of these, how many are clearly identifiable to members of the public as belonging to your institution? | Nearly all. Exceptions include the Vice-Chancellor and the Director of the Waite Institute. | 26 of which 25 are in Central Pool. | 16 of those used on public roads. In addition 17 vehicles have plates with prefix RAC | 11 | 18 |
| (b) Are any moves in train to ensure that the remainder are so identifiable? | Intend to tighten arrangements so that all are marked unless specifically exempted by the Bursar. | No. | — | The College is currently considering the matter of identification for all its vehicles. | No. |

| | The University of Adelaide | The Flinders University of SA | Roseworthy Agric. College | SA College of Advanced Education | SA Institute of Technology |
|---|--|---|---|--|---|
| 3. What is your institution's policy in relation to the use of these vehicles? In particular could you indicate: | Two vehicles are permanently assigned to the Vice-Chancellor and the Director, National Centre in Petroleum Geology and Geophysics. When he is in South Australia the Director of the Waite Institute has use of a vehicle. The Director of the University Radio Station is allowed to take a car home at night for security purposes only, although staff may take a vehicle home on occasions when it is efficient to do so. | Other than one vehicle, which is allocated to the Vice-Chancellor, the vehicles are available only for use on University business (includes research seminars, conferences teaching at other institutions, meetings, etc). Superintendent of Grounds and Services Superintendent have vehicles for travel between work and place of residence. This is for the purpose of their being called out in an emergency. Other than home/work travel private use is not permitted. | One vehicle is assigned to the Director but is used by other staff as the need arises. The Director is authorised to use his vehicle for private use provided that he meets fuel and other cash costs. All other vehicles are available for use on College business only. | 14 vehicles are assigned to senior staff (Principal, Directors, Faculty Deans, Heads of Units) to the extent that they have first call on their use. They are permitted to garage the vehicle at home. Otherwise all vehicles are available only for College business. | These vehicles are permanently assigned to the Directors and the two Assistant Directors. These vehicles may be used for private purposes. |
| (a) whether any of these vehicles are permanently assigned to particular individuals and, if so, how many and to whom; and | | | | | |
| (b) your institution's policy in relation to the use of such vehicles for private purposes. | | | | | |
| 4. Are vehicles provided to any individual as a condition of their employment? If so, please give details and indicate whether these have been included in the response to 1. | See 3 above (although it is not explicitly stated by the University that this is a condition of employment). The vehicles are included in 1. | The Vice-Chancellor's vehicle is assigned as a condition of employment. It is included in 1. | The Director's vehicle is assigned as a condition of employment. No indication is given as to whether it is included in 1 although it is probably safe to assume that this is the case. | Information re conditions of employment not sought. The vehicles are included in 1. | The three vehicles identified in 3 are allocated as a condition of employment. They are included in 1. |
| 5. Does your institution pay Fringe Benefits Tax in relation to any of the vehicles covered by (1) and (4)? If so please give details in relation to payments during 1986. | Fringe Benefits Tax is paid regularly in relation to four vehicles (Vice-Chancellor, Waite, Geology/Geophysics, SUV). In addition some tax is paid in relation to other vehicles on occasion (1 in September Quarter 1986). The September and December Quarter 1986 payments were \$965 and \$1 113 respectively. | Fringe Benefits Tax is paid in relation to the Vice-Chancellor's car. The payment in 1986 was \$1 295. | Fringe Benefits Tax is paid in relation to the Director's vehicle. The payment in 1986 was \$203. | Fringe Benefits Tax is paid in relation to the appropriate proportion of the fourteen vehicles. September and December Quarter 1986 payments were \$8 773 and \$7 625 respectively. | Fringe Benefits Tax is paid in relation to the three assigned vehicles and in relation to some use of pool vehicles. The total payment in 1986 was \$3 340. |

GOVERNMENT PRINTER

207. **The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY** (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport: Who is conducting the review of the activities of the Government Printer and what are the terms of reference?

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: A review of the activities of the Government Printer is not being conducted, however, a consultant from the Office of the Government Management Board is assessing the future strategies of the Government Printing Division. There are no formal terms of reference, however, there is a statement covering the assessment. The assessment's basic aim is to examine the options available to enable the division to continue to be financially viable and to provide an effective range of services to Government agencies.

DEPARTMENTAL LOSSES

257. **Mr BECKER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Lands:

1. What was the total amount of all items of stock lost, stolen or missing from each department and authority under the Minister's control for the years ended 30 June 1986 and 1987?

2. What value of goods, and which, were recovered during each period?

3. Have internal auditing and improved stock controls helped reduce stock deficiencies and theft and, if not, why not?

4. What amounts of cash and/or cheques have been lost or stolen in the same periods?

The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT: The replies are as follows:
Department of Lands

1. 1986-87—\$912.

2. No items were recovered.

3. Yes. The Department of Lands is currently updating and reviewing the plant register with a view to improved recording. Stock and plant checks are currently done on an annual basis, these may be increased to half-yearly to improve the controls which are currently in place. Managers are being made more aware of the importance of plant controls within their areas.

4. Nil.

Department of Marine and Harbors

1. 1986-87—\$25 240.

2. No items were recovered.

3. Yes. The implementation of computerised distribution and control system for recording of stock has decreased the levels of stock held due to improved control over stock balances. The pre-billing mode used in DCS has permitted the stock records to be identified prior to the issue of stock thus identifying incorrect stock issues quickly and allowing prompt amendment of records.

4. Nil.

Department of Woods and Forests

1. 1986-87—\$6 506.

2. No items were recovered.

3. Yes. Each incident was reviewed for deficiencies in security arrangements. Where appropriate, additional security measures were taken. Overall, security measures are considered adequate and this is reflected in the very small amounts of losses.

4. Cash amounting to \$8.00.

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

1. What was the total amount of all items of stock lost, stolen or missing from each department and authority under the Minister's control for the years ended 30 June 1986 and 1987?

2. What value of goods, and which, were recovered during each period?

3. Have internal auditing and improved stock controls helped reduce stock deficiencies and theft and, if not, why not?

4. What amounts of cash and/or cheques have been lost or stolen in the same periods?

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: The replies are as follows:
Department of Labour

1. The department has no record of any stock lost, missing or stolen.

2. N/A.

3. Apart from stationery items, the department does not hold any stocks in relation to its operations. Controls in this area are considered adequate.

4. (a) During 1985-86 \$140 was stolen or lost.

(b) In 1986-87 \$13 was lost or stolen.

Department of Correctional Services

1. The department has no record of any stock lost, stolen or missing.

2. N/A.

3. An inventories record has been established at Adelaide Gaol and subsequent stocktakes will reveal any stock deficiencies. Other locations will have similar methods introduced if and when resources become available.

4. During 1985-86 \$100 was lost or stolen from Adelaide Gaol. In 1986-87 a break-in at Salisbury District Office resulted in \$4.41 of petty cash and \$45.38 of stamps being stolen.

CARRICK HILL PAINTINGS

268. **Mr BECKER** (on notice) asked the Premier:

1. Why was the member for Hanson not invited to the rehanging at Carrick Hill of the paintings stolen and recovered last year?

2. What was the cost of the new frames and have proper colour photos and identification marks now been recorded?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The replies are as follows:

1. The rehanging at Carrick Hill of the paintings stolen and recovered last year was organised by the previous Director. There was no invitation list. In addition to the Premier and the press only some trustees, the Chief Executive Officer from the Department for the Arts, some staff and guides who were on duty at the time and a few members of the public visiting Carrick Hill were in attendance. However, I concede that in view of the member for Hanson's involvement in the recovery of the paintings it would have been appropriate for him to be present.

2. The new frames, purchased from Belgium, cost \$4 000. Further colour photographs have been taken and all identification marks evident have been recorded.

SCHOOL TRIP

269. **Mr OLSEN** (on notice) asked the Minister of Education representing the Minister of Community Welfare:

In the week beginning Monday, 17 August 1987, did the Department for Community Welfare arrange for a group of school students from the northern areas to travel by bus to the Victorian snowfields and, if so:

(a) how many students were involved;

(b) what was the purpose of the trip; and

(c) what was the cost?

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: On Monday, 17 August 1987, a group of children from the Iron Triangle attended the Aboriginal cultural camp, Camp Jungai, in the Victorian Alps. All of these children are extensively involved with the Department for Community Welfare because of offending or other particular problems and all are regarded as at high risk.

(a) 19 youths total: 12 Aboriginal, 7 non-Aboriginal.

(b) Camp Jungai offers a unique experience for youths as it is a camp entirely owned and operated by Aborigines. The camp, by its very nature, offers several things:

(1) Aboriginal leaders model pride in being Aboriginal and a positive attitude towards the future.

(2) Camp Jungai has a main theme of cultural identity and awareness where, via a full-time cultural officer, Aboriginal and other youths can learn and experience Aboriginal culture, both traditional and contemporary. Reports from Victoria suggest after attending the camp Victorian Aboriginal youth have a far enhanced identity.

(3) Camp Jungai offers the opportunity for Aborigines and non-Aborigines to mix, reducing misunderstanding of each other which can lead to racial tensions. Camp Jungai's slogan is race relations through recreation.

(4) Camp Jungai offers various activities depending on the time of year, hence snow skiing in winter. All youths who attended were of low socio-economic status and combined with family attitudes and other factors often did not have the confidence and character building opportunities others take for granted.

(c) \$4 082. Shared mainly between Government agencies with a small amount coming from local Rotary and Apex.

TECHNOLOGY BASE

275. **Mr BECKER** (on notice) asked the Minister of State Development and Technology: What action is the Government taking to increase the total technology base in South Australia of electronic, electrical and mechanical engineers and, if none, why not, and will it do so as a matter of urgency?

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: To help provide a more appropriately trained engineering work force, the State Government has encouraged and supported educational and training institutions to broaden the educational curriculum for engineering students so as to increase their occupational mobility and include management and business skills in engineering training courses.

Under the auspices of the South Australian Industrial and Commercial Training Commission a network of training advisory committees has been established representing specific industry sectors. An Electrical/Electronics Engineering Training Advisory Committee and a Metals Engineering Training Advisory Committee has been established to provide advice on the employment and training needs for these sectors.

The training of professional engineers in higher education institutions is ultimately one for the Commonwealth Government. However, South Australia continues to press for increased places in those institutions with a particular emphasis in the applied sciences, technologies, commerce and business.

South Australia's academic and trade related training institutes have been consulted and are structuring their courses to provide sufficient numbers of suitably trained graduates. This aims to cover the anticipated needs of both the submarine project and the additional projects it is likely to generate.

Discussions have taken place regarding the need for suitably trained graduates with the Commonwealth Government.

The Commonwealth Government has agreed to facilitate entry for extended periods for immigrants possessing special skills required for the submarine project where it can be demonstrated that there is a lack of that specific skill in Australia.

Should any South Australian company encounter difficulties in locating specialist skilled labour because of the submarine project, representations will be made on their behalf to be treated in the same way.

PETROL STATION PROPRIETORS

277. **Mr S.J. BAKER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Labour: How many petrol stations have closed in the metropolitan area since the deregulation of trading hours and how many proprietors were bankrupted in the process?

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: Information available from the records of the Motor Fuel Licensing Board show that 25 licences (licences are issued where the main business is retailing of motor fuel) and eight permits (permits are issued where retailing of motor fuel is secondary to the main business) were cancelled during the period in question. Information is not available on what proportion of those licences/permits cancelled were located in the metropolitan area or whether the cancellations were due to reasons other than the normal turnover of business in the industry.

AUSTRALIA RECONSTRUCTED

280. **Mr S.J. BAKER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Employment and Further Education: What is the cost of convening the seminar on 16 September 1987 to discuss *Australia Reconstructed* and in particular, what amounts are being paid by the Government for air fares and accommodation for the interstate and overseas guest speakers?

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: The cost of mounting the seminar on 16 September to discuss *Australia Reconstructed*

was \$2 300. This money is for the hire of the hall, hire of audio visual equipment and providing coffee and biscuits. This State has made no contribution whatsoever for air fares or accommodation for any of the South Australian, interstate or overseas speakers.

The attendance was approximately 300 people. At \$2 300 for running the seminar, the cost per person was approximately \$7.67.

SAFE MANUAL HANDLING

282. **Mr S.J. BAKER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Labour: Further to the reply of 18 August 1987 to Question on Notice No. 112 concerning the Government's deliberations on the draft Code of Practice for Safe Manual Handling, can a copy of the submission be provided to the member for Mitcham on a confidential basis?

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: Yes. A copy of the submission on the Code of Practice for Safe Manual Handling will be forwarded.

ELECTRICITY

283. **Mr S.J. BAKER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Mines and Energy: Further to the reply on 25 August 1987 to Question on Notice No. 105, can details be provided of how South Australia will be guaranteed electricity for sale at a price lower than it could generate from its own available plant?

The Hon. R.G. PAYNE: The control centres of the three electricity authorities will be linked so that the generation schedule for each for the following day can be analysed to identify opportunities for economic interchange. The schedule will be modified through the day in light of emerging factors. Accordingly, any agreement to import or export electricity would be made with full knowledge of the economic effect on all systems.

COMMUNITY SERVICE ORDER SCHEME

284. **Mr BECKER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Correctional Services:

1. Is the Community Service Order Scheme still operating from Glenelg and, if not, why not, and, if so, what orders operate from this location and will the scheme be expanded?
2. How many people have been placed on this scheme during the past six months and from which locations?
3. How many supervisors are now employed for the scheme and have any been rebranded in the past 12 months and, if so, why?

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: The replies are as follows:

1. Yes. Community service orders operate from the Glenelg area and a small overflow from the southern edge covered by the Port Adelaide district office. Any expansion of the scheme would be dependent on the courts.
2. The following table indicates the numbers of community service offenders received by Glenelg district office from 1 January 1987 to 31 July 1987, by court of origin.

| | Jan | Feb | Mar | Apr | May | June | July |
|-------------------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|------|------|
| Supreme District | — | — | — | — | — | 1 | — |
| Adelaide M/C | 3 | 2 | 1 | 7 | 3 | 4 | 7 |
| Glenelg M/C | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | — | — | — |
| Holden Hill M/C | — | — | — | — | — | — | 1 |
| Port Adelaide M/C | — | 2 | 2 | 1 | — | 2 | 3 |
| Country M/C | 2 | — | — | — | — | — | 1 |
| Totals | 6 | 5 | 4 | 9 | 3 | 7 | 12 |

3. There are five casual paid supervisors rostered for work with the Community Service Order Scheme. They have been on the roster for over 12 months and are employed as needed. They are not guaranteed any regular basic hours of work. An initial decline in the numbers of community service offenders following the closure of the Glenelg Court reduced the demand for their services.

PRISONS

286. Mr BECKER (on notice) asked the Minister of Correctional Services:

1. Why has the Minister not replied to or acknowledged the telex of 27 August from the member for Hanson by 9 September 1987?

2. How much are prisoners paid on a daily basis if they work within a prison complex and how much are they paid if they refuse to work?

3. What variety of tree or shrub is growing in yard two of the Adelaide Remand Centre?

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: The replies are as follows:

1. The trivial nature of the question did not warrant an urgent reply.

2. (a) An average of \$21.27 per week.

(b) 10 cents per day.

3. *Crataegus phaenopyrum*.